

CHRISTIAN PERFECTION

EXTRA ZUKONG

RENTAL

ack. Postcard  
25-8-64.

# ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate WALTER STÄDELI

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Degree P h . D . Date 10th July 1964

Title of Thesis A STUDY OF CHRISTIAN PERFECTION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

The saying Mt v.48 is modelled on Lev xix.2 (cf. xi.44, xx.7). However, the term qadhosh // ἁγίος is replaced by tamim // τέλειος. In Lev xix.2 qadhosh is the main characteristic of the people of Israel, similarly as in Ex xix.6: the Chosen People is 'consecrated' to its God. At the time of Jesus the negative aspect of holiness, i.e. separation from the Gentiles and from idolatry, seems to have been emphasized. Hence, if Jesus would have quoted Lev xix.2 as a conclusion of the Antitheses (he quotes Lev xix.18 in Mt v.43), this would have contradicted the antithesis v.44. Furthermore, as Israel as a nation was considered to be holy, Jesus had to use a stronger term to express the main characteristic of the eschatological community.

The religious term tamim - which stems from sacrificial terminology and is reapplied to the worshipper - is a cultic and relational term that expresses the wholeness of consecration to God (cf. Dt xviii.13). It is most significant that tamim appears as the first 'condition of admission' in Ps xv.2, holek tamim (cf. Pss xxvi.1,11, lxxxiv.11): 'He whose way of life is wholly consecrated'. Hence the authentic meaning of Mt v.48 may be given as follows:

You, therefore, must be wholly consecrated,  
as your heavenly Father is wholly consecrated.

The injunction to be wholly consecrated summarizes the conditions (contained in the Beatitudes) for God's coming, or for the wholeness of His consecration. The formulation 48b is unique in the whole Bible; it is in accordance with the teaching of the historical Jesus.

If this interpretation is correct, both the legalistic understanding of the final redaction of Matthew, which regards τέλειος as a near synonym of ἁγίος, and the idea of 'imitatio Dei' are secondary. This is not to say that the ethical aspect is missing: The οὖν in Mt v. 48a refers back to the Antitheses, or more particularly to v.45. Hence we may paraphrase v.48 in this way: You, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven, must be wholly consecrated to Him, as your heavenly Father is wholly consecrated to you. This implies two things: (1) wholeness of consecration is the conditio sine qua non of divine sonship; (2) divine sonship is realised only in filial obedience. What Jesus teaches on the Mount of the Sermon, then, may be described as THE WAY OF THE SON.



It is possible that the author to the Hebrews reinterprets Jesus' concept of perfection, and that in the sense that the perfection of the Son is his entire and conclusive consecration as High Priest, which is the realisation of his sonship, whilst the perfection of the sons is their entire and conclusive consecration to a priestly service by the single offering of Christ. The Sermon on the Mount already implies that the members of the eschatological community participate in Jesus' sonship and thus also - to a certain extent - in his priestly service.



A STUDY OF  
CHRISTIAN PERFECTION  
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE  
SERMON ON THE MOUNT

BY

WALTER STÄDELI

A THESIS PRESENTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH IN THE FACULTY OF DIVINITY

EDINBURGH

1964



## P R E F A C E

The roots of the present study reach back to Indonesia, where I have had the privilege to serve as a pastor of the Protestant Church, first on the island of Java, at the foot of the holy mountain 'Gunung Ardjuno', and then on the famous island of Bali, in the midst of a people whose life and religion is directed entirely towards 'Gunung Agung', the 'Navel of the World' and 'Father of all Humanity', the dwelling place of the deities that are worshipped in hundreds of temples, which are the most noticeable feature of this island. It is worth noting that the Balinese describe their temples as 'palaces of the gods', where the gods come from the holy mountain in response to specific rituals and offerings. What I have seen and heard in Indonesia made dubious the views propounded by scholars in our day, namely that the Sermon on the Mount 'is merely a collection of unrelated sayings of diverse origins, a patchwork, which cannot possibly retain the pre-eminence once accorded to it as the authoritative source for the teaching of Jesus,' and that the mountain mentioned in Mt v. 1 is nothing but a 'literary motif'. I want to argue in the present study that the Sermon on the Mount actually is the authoritative source of the teaching of Jesus, and I attempt to show on the following pages that the Sermon may be understood against the background of the focal point of Israel's life at the time of Jesus, namely the Temple on holy Mount Zion.

My indebtedness to many is gratefully acknowledged in numerous footnotes throughout the following study. I am especially indebted to my academic supervisors, the Right Rev. Professor J. S. STEWART, D.D., and the Rev. R. A. S. BARBOUR, M.C., B.D., for their patient and helpful criticisms of the thesis as it progressed toward completion. Many thanks are due also to the Rev. Dr. I. A. MOIR, B.D., and to the Rev. Dr. R. CLEMENTS, B.A., B.D., who very kindly have read over part of my typescript in its final stages and made a number of suggestions towards improvement, and also to Miss J. GRIGOR and Miss E. N. CLARK, who have read the drafts of several chapters, to whom I owe a number of linguistic improvements.

I also take this opportunity of remembering with gratitude my former teachers of New Testament, the late Rev. Dr. H. GELZER, formerly Principal of the Theological Missionary Training College at Basel, and the late Professor K. L. SCHMIDT, D.D., formerly Basel University, and of thanking the Rev. Professor Dr. O. CULLMANN, D.D., Basel University, for all that I have learnt from him.



I want to express my thanks also to the Staffs of the University Library, Edinburgh, of the New College Library, Edinburgh, and of the Zentralbibliothek, Zürich, for their untiring readiness in providing the necessary literature. Many thanks also to the Staff of St. Colm's College, Edinburgh, both for the use of their library and for their hospitality.

Furthermore, I record gratefully the service performed by Miss D. E. THOMPSON and her typists, who prepared the final typescript with great care.

Finally, I would like to thank the members of the Board of the Basel Mission, who generously permitted me to use an extended furlough of almost three years for the preparation of the present thesis. It is hoped that this thesis will be fruitful for my future tasks as a teacher of New Testament in Indonesia. The old-fashioned Indonesian designation 'nasarani' for Christians relates the Indonesian Christians to Jesus of Nazareth, i. e. to the so-called historical Jesus, whose teaching and person is central for the present study. May it help to bring both Asians and Westerners to the point of direct confrontation with the Asian Jesus of Nazareth.

Stäfa (Switzerland), June 1964.

W. ST.

## CONTENTS

	ABBREVIATIONS	6
I	INTRODUCTION	7
II	THE CHARACTER OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT	20
	1 The intention of the final redaction	20
	2 The place and structure of the Sermon on the Mount in the synoptic tradition	31
	3 The significance of the Mount of the Sermon	47
III	THE PRESUPPOSITION OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT	68
	1 The concept of initiation	76
	2 The kingship of Yahweh	88
	3 The sonship of the king	102
IV	THE 'PLACE IN LIFE' AND THE MEANING OF PERFECTION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT	128
	1 The origin of the term tamim and its relation to qadhosh	130
	2 The first 'place in life' of tamim	137
	3 The second 'place in life' of tamim	161
V	THE 'PLACE IN LIFE' AND THE MEANING OF PERFECTION IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS	176
	1 The evidence of an inter-Testamental religious community	176
	2 Perfection in the context of initiation	183
	3 The Way of Perfection	194
VI	JESUS AND THE TEMPLE	198
	1 The beginning of the Way	205
	2 On the Way	221
	3 Returned to Mount Zion	240

<b>VII</b>	<b>THE REALISATION OF PERFECTION</b>	<b>257</b>
	1 The cultic function of the Beatitudes	257
	2 The cultic interpretation of the Beatitudes	273
	3 The mission of the eschatological community	298
<b>VIII</b>	<b>THE WAY OF PERFECTION</b>	<b>306</b>
	1 The cultic significance of the 'I' of the Antitheses	306
	2 The cultic interpretation of the Antitheses	317
	3 The secrets of the Way of Jesus	335
<b>IX</b>	<b>THE CONCEPT OF PERFECTION IN THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS</b>	<b>372</b>
	1 The evidence of the Letter to the Hebrews	372
	2 The perfection of the Son	384
	3 The perfection of the sons	388
<b>X</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>396</b>
	A The historical Jesus	397
	B The Sermon on the Mount	400
	C Jesus' concept of perfection in the context of the Sermon on the Mount	402
	D Practical conclusions	406
	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>410</b>
	<b>INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES</b>	<b>421</b>
	A The Old Testament	421
	B The New Testament	427
	<b>INDEX OF REFERENCES TO THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS</b>	<b>435</b>

---



# ABBREVIATIONS

BFT	Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie
BKW	Bible Key Words (from Gerhard Kittel's TWNT)
DSS	The Dead Sea Scrolls
ET	English translation
<u>ExpT</u>	<u>The Expository Times</u>
ICC	The International Critical Commentary
LXX	The Septuagint
MS(S)	Manuscript(s)
MT	The Masoretic text
NT	The New Testament
<u>NTS</u>	<u>New Testament Studies</u>
<u>OAB</u>	<u>The Oxford Annotated Bible (New York-Oxford 1962)</u>
OT	The Old Testament
<u>OTS</u>	<u>Oudtestamentische Studiën</u>
<u>RB</u>	<u>Revue Biblique</u>
<u>RGG</u>	<u>Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (3rd ed., Tübingen 1957 - )</u>
<u>RHPR</u>	<u>Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses</u>
RSV	The Revised Standard Version of the Bible
<u>TLZ</u>	<u>Theologische Literaturzeitung</u>
TS	Theologische Studien
<u>TSK</u>	<u>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</u>
<u>TWBB</u>	<u>A Theological Word Book of the Bible (ed. A. RICHARDSON, London 1950)</u>
<u>TWNT</u>	<u>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament (ed. G. KITTEL; G. FRIEDRICH, Stuttgart 1933 - )</u>
<u>TZ</u>	<u>Theologische Zeitschrift</u>
<u>VT</u>	<u>Vetus Testamentum</u>
<u>ZAW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
<u>ZNW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>

All other abbreviations are customary or self-explanatory. The titles of essays and articles are underlined in the footnotes but - as customary - put between inverted commas in the Bibliography. If not indicated otherwise, all scripture quotations are from the RSV. Where Hebrew terms are quoted, a simple transliteration has been used which, it is hoped, is obvious. Quotations from books which are not written in or translated into English are given in our own translation.

# I

## INTRODUCTION

The subject of the present study is 'Christian Perfection in the context of the Sermon on the Mount'. This title actually points to two things, namely to the saying Mt. v.48 and to the Sermon on the Mount as a whole, i.e. Mt v-vii. We admit the possibility that their inter-relationship is irrelevant for the understanding of either. Nevertheless, 'Christian Perfection in the context of the Sermon on the Mount' is of special interest because Matthew ascribes this postulated entity to Jesus himself.

At first glance, the fact that the term 'perfect' (τέλειος) used in Mt v.48 occurs only once again within the synoptic tradition, viz. Mt xix.21, seems to speak against its authenticity. A Greek concordance shows, however, that the term is found elsewhere in the New Testament. Furthermore, the following passage by RUDOLF BULTMANN drew our attention to the problem of historical sequence, i.e. to a possible development of the concept of perfection in the New Testament, starting from Mt v.48: 'Therefore, it cannot surprise us that the concept of "perfection" (τελειότης, τέλειον) takes on a new meaning. In Mt. 5:48 τέλειος (Lk. 6:36 has a different word) seems still to be used in the sense of Hebrew shalem or tamim (whole and complete, whole-hearted, without breach or inner dividedness). In Mt. 19:21 (not found in Mk. 10:21) it means, on the contrary, "perfect" in the sense of perfectionism; likewise in Did. 1:4; 6:2, in the latter of which two levels of morality are clearly distinguished. Though Paul had used τέλειος not with the Semitic but with a Greek meaning, he meant by it not "perfection" but "adulthood" (I Cor. 14:20; Phil. 3:15); the same meaning appears in Heb. 6:1.<sup>1</sup>

It is not surprising, considering the great interest in Biblical concepts in contemporary theology, that the concept of perfection is getting more and more attention in recent scholarly discussion.

---

1 R. BULTMANN, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. II (ET), London 1955, p. 224/25.

First to be mentioned is a dissertation submitted in 1954 by TORBJÖRN OSNES<sup>1</sup>. Although this dissertation - which is written in Norwegian - contains a summary in English, it escaped the notice of the following two scholars who wrote about the same subject respectively in 1958 and 1959, namely B. RIGAUX<sup>2</sup> and PAUL JOHANNES DU PLESSIS.<sup>3</sup> Among other works of the same period, approximately, to the present, which, from different angles, discussed 'perfection' in relation to Mt v.48, we may mention here the books by CONNY EDLUND<sup>4</sup>, ERNST PERCY<sup>5</sup>, V.E. HASLER<sup>6</sup>, HENRIK LJUNGMAN<sup>7</sup>, HERBERT BRAUN<sup>8</sup>, JACQUES DUPONT<sup>9</sup>, WOLFGANG TRILLING<sup>10</sup>, E.P. BLAIR<sup>11</sup>, E.J. TINSLEY<sup>12</sup>, GÜNTHER BORNKAMM<sup>13</sup>, W.P. DE BOER<sup>14</sup>, GERHARD BARTH<sup>15</sup> and W.D. DAVIES<sup>16</sup>.

1 T. OSNES, Fullkommenhetstanken i Det nye testamente. En studie over begrebet teleios. (Diss. Oslo) Oslo 1954.

2 B. RIGAUX, Révélation des Mystères et Perfection à Qumran et dans le Nouveau Testament, NTS Vol. IV, 1957-58, pp.237-262.

3 P.J. DU PLESSIS, TELEIOS. The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament. (Diss. Kampen) Kampen 1959. (Cf. Review in TZ, Jahrg. 16, Heft 5, Sept.-Oct. 1960, p. 416/17, by C. EDLUND.)

4 C. EDLUND, Das Auge der Einfalt. Eine Untersuchung zu Matth. 6,22-23 und Luk. 11,34-35. Uppsala 1952.

5 E. PERCY, Die Botschaft Jesu. Eine traditionskritische und exegetische Untersuchung, Lund 1953.

6 V.E. HASLER, Gesetz und Evangelium in der alten Kirche bis Origenes. (Diss. Zürich) Zürich/Frankfurt 1953.

7 H. LJUNGMAN, Das Gesetz erfüllen. Matth. 5,17ff. und 3,15 untersucht. (Diss. Lund) Lund 1954.

8 H. BRAUN, Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus. Jesus von Nazareth und die essenische Qumransekte, I - II, Tübingen 1957.

9 J. DUPONT, Les Béatitudes. Le problème littéraire - Les deux versions du Sermon sur la montagne et des Béatitudes. (2nd ed.) Louvain 1958.

10 W. TRILLING, Das Wahre Israel. Studien zur Theologie des Matthäusevangeliums. Leipzig 1959.

11 E.P. BLAIR, Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew. New York - Nashville 1960.

12 E.J. TINSLEY, The Imitation of God in Christ. An essay on the Biblical Basis of Christian Spirituality, London 1960.

13 G. BORNKAMM, Jesus of Nazareth. London 1963.

14 W.P. DE BOER, The Imitation of Paul. An exegetical study. (Diss. Kampen) Kampen 1962.

15 G. BARTH, Matthew's Understanding of the Law. in: G. BORNKAMM - G. BARTH - H.J. HELD, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew (ET), London 1963.

16 W.D. DAVIES, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount. Cambridge 1964.



At the beginning of his summary, T. OSNES states the purpose of his study as follows: 'It has been the main purpose of this book to undertake an exegetical investigation of those parts of the New Testament where the term occurs, and thus, based on this, to give a contribution to NT theology, especially to the conception of perfection.'<sup>1</sup> This statement implies that the author regards the New Testament, and consequently its theology, as a whole.<sup>2</sup>

This is confirmed by the following two passages, which give us an impression of the final results of his study: 'Considering the term *τέλειος* we find that it appears as a goal for those having entered into the new mankind, into the Body of Christ. In fact, it appears as a goal for the entire new humanity. Both the individual man and the Body of Christ are here considered in their historical existence. Thus it is assumed that the individual member of the Body of Christ has not yet, in his historical existence reached the goal which God has set him. Nor does the Body of Christ per se contain the fulness of Christ.'<sup>3</sup> 'To be *τέλειος* then, has in the New Testament the meaning of belonging with one's whole being to this eschatological reality, and being directed from here in one's historical existence. Thus the term is eschatologically coloured. That man only, who in this time is to be found in this reality, will, when the new era dawns, be allowed to enter the perfect kingdom of God.'<sup>4</sup>

P.J. DU PLESSIS' first chapter contains this formulation of his intention: 'To trace the main differences of opinion will be the concern of this chapter, to be followed by a semasiological inquiry into its leading incidence in Greek and Jewish worlds, and finally an exegetical comparison of the N.T. material. By its content and method, therefore, this study aspires to be a contribution to the religious historical background and terminology of the New Testament.'<sup>5</sup>

---

1 T. OSNES, *Teleios*, p.351.

2 Cf. ALAN RICHARDSON, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, (2nd impr.) London 1961, Preface, p.10: 'We must all have some notion at the back of our minds about the meaning of the New Testament as a whole, and it is just as well that some people should try to say what it is.'

3 T. OSNES, *ibid.*, p.355.

4 *ibid.*, p.371

5 P.J. DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, p.11.

In his conclusions, DU PLESSIS first summarizes his findings concerning perfection in three statements, according to the parts of his main discussion. The first statement reads as follows: "In the Synoptics, John and Acts we had reason to consider the above described O.T. motif as eminently present. The passages discussed radiated a sense of the interrelation between God and man, and called for unswerving devotion. Therefore it is possible to consider the concept of perfect love, which is preferentially employed by John, as synonymous with the quality of perfection. Both concepts conveyed love not as a sentimental affection but as the expression of the new being - this in contrast to the moral connotations with which the idea of perfect love is emburdened in holiness movements. One who stands in the relationship unreservedly is *teleios*."<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless, DU PLESSIS too regards the New Testament concept of perfection as a unity: "Reduced to its fundamental properties the use of *teleios* in the N.T. conveys that as indicative perfection it is consummate redemptive grace, and as imperative it is the dynamic perserverance to be in accordance with the measure of this indicative. Paul provided the full dimension by visualizing the eschatological perspective of the concept; in the constitutively perfect age this dynamic will come to rest. - At the end of our inquiry it is possible to see how the religious *telos* motif of the O.T. emerges throughout the N.T., yet in an entirely new dimension. This dimension is Christ, and this makes the *telos* concept of the N.T. a unique and unequalled one. It follows that *teleios* is consequently also unparalleled. The idea of perfection as expressed by *teleios* is thus constituted by the redemptive historical motif Christ, Who having been made perfect became the source of eternal salvation to all who obey Him (Heb. 5.9), and as Paul preaches: "But from Him you have your being in Christ Jesus, Who became for us wisdom manifested from God, which is righteousness, sanctification and redemption." (1 Cor. 1.30)."<sup>2</sup>

On the whole, the two studies by OSNES and DU PLESSIS are important contributions to our understanding of the term *τῆλειος* as used in different parts of the New Testament. Moreover, they contain a wealth of comparative material from the Old Testament and extra-Biblical sources. For all that, their final conclusions are not quite satisfactory from a historical point of view. Of course, it

---

<sup>1</sup> P.J. DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, p.242.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*, p.244.



sounds like a sweeping statement to say that their notion of New Testament unity and theology is too uncritical. To mention just one point, P.J. DU PLESSIS, e.g.,<sup>1</sup> in the outline of his study follows the canonical order of books of the New Testament without giving any thought to the problems of historical sequence or of actual relationship between the different concepts. Consequently, 'Christian Perfection' tends to become a timeless 'idea' and Christ a mere 'motif'.

Over against this, some of the other authors mentioned above, namely W. TRILLING, G.BARTH and W.D.DAVIES, explicitly attempt to understand the concept of perfection as contained in Matthew from the point of view of the final redaction and the setting in the Early Church.<sup>2</sup> This method certainly points the way to a deeper understanding of the concept of perfection. However, as J.DUPONT pointed out,<sup>3</sup> about half of all New Testament scholars who have expressed their opinion in this matter hold Mt v.48 to be authentic, i.e., nearer to the original saying than Lk vi.36, which does not use the term *τέλειος* but *ὁκτεύων*. This suggests that it is a real possibility that 'Christian Perfection in the context of the Sermon on the Mount' is, above all, Jesus' own view of perfection, and is thus to be understood against the background of his ministry. If this can be shown to be probable,<sup>4</sup> we may regard Mt v.48 as the key to the concepts of perfection contained in other parts of the New Testament.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 Our lack of understanding of the Norwegian language prevents us from following T.OSNES' book properly outside the English summary. But the tendency of the main section of the latter, i.e. 'The Idea of Perfection in the NT', pp. 353-363, is clearly 'harmonizing'.

2 See our discussion below, VIII.3, beginning.

3 See J.DUPONT, *Béatitudes*, p.153

4 Cf. A.RICHARDSON, *Theology*, p.11: 'New Testament Theology, in the sense in which this book employs the term, cannot "prove" historical (or theological) hypotheses, but it can test them. It can shew that some hypotheses are better than others, because they enable more facts to be "seen" in a coherent way.'

5 Cf. R.NEWTON FLEW, *Jesus and His Way*. A Study of the Ethics of the New Testament, London 1963, p.15: 'The key to any teaching of perfection is the passage on love of enemies, in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5.43-8).'



As regards the method of this study, we may choose one of the two new trends of contemporary New Testament investigations. On the one hand, recent scholarly discussion concerning the synoptic tradition no longer emphasizes the history of the synoptic tradition from the oral period to the written Gospels,<sup>1</sup> but the individual Gospel as a literary unit. This is to say, after literary criticism and historical criticism, source criticism and form criticism, the discussion - especially on the continent - has focussed more and more on criticism of the final redaction, in short: redaction criticism.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 See R. BULTMANN, The History of the Synoptic Tradition (ET - 1st. Germ. ed. 1921), Oxford 1963; MARTIN DIBELIUS, From Tradition to Gospel (ET - 1st. Germ. ed. 1919), London 1934; R. H. LIGHTFOOT, History and Interpretation in the Gospels, London 1935; VINCENT TAYLOR, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. (3rd ed.) London 1945.

2 This expression corresponds to the generally accepted parallel expression form criticism (Germ.: 'Formgeschichte' (DIBELIUS: NT; GUNKEL: OT) - 'Redaktionsgeschichte').  
 On Matthew see, e.g., K. STENDAHL, The School of St. Matthew, Uppsala 1954; G. SCHILLE Das Evangelium des Matthäus als Katechismus, NTS 4, 1957-58, pp. 101-114; W. TRILLING, op.cit.; G. BORNKAMM - G. BARTH - H. J. HELD, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew (ET), London 1963; E. P. BLAIR, op.cit.; TH. DE KRUIF, Der Sohn des Lebendigen Gottes, Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Matthäusevangeliums, Romae 1962; GEORG STRECKER, Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit, Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus, Göttingen 1962; REINHART HUMMEL, Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium, München 1963.  
 On Mark see, e.g., AUSTIN FARRER, A Study in St. Mark, London 1951; HARALD RIESENFELD, Tradition und Redaktion im Markusevangelium, in: NT Studien für R. BULTMANN, (pp. 157-167), Berlin 1954; W. MARXSEN, Der Evangelist Markus, Göttingen 1956; G. SCHILLE, Bemerkungen zur Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, Rahmen und Aufbau des Markusevangeliums, NTS 4, 1957-58, pp. 1-24; J. M. ROBINSON, The Problem of History in Mark, London 1957.  
 On Luke see, e.g., R. MORGENTHAUER, Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis, Gestalt und Gehalt der Kunst des Lukas I-II, Zürich 1949; HANS CONZELMANN, The Theology of St. Luke (ET), London 1960; G. KLEIN, Die Zwölf Apostel, Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee, Göttingen 1961.

The question whether this new trend is a new approach in contrast to form criticism<sup>1</sup> or whether the latter is the indispensable presupposition for redaction criticism,<sup>2</sup> is still disputed. It is quite certain, however, that - at least to a certain extent - the problem of the final redaction as the last stage of the history of the synoptic tradition was already included in the original conception of the form critics.<sup>3</sup> Hence, the relationship between the older and the newer trend is a question of emphasis.

Whilst a number of New Testament scholars are working on the end of the history of the synoptic tradition, others turn in a new quest of the historical Jesus<sup>4</sup> to its beginning.<sup>5</sup>

'It began with Jesus of Nazareth' - this is the heading of a chapter in a recent book by HEINZ ZÄHRNT.<sup>6</sup> 'It is now time,' this author states in another chapter, 'to give an account of this latest and most interesting trend at present taking place in Protestant theology, scattered about many individual publications. We described it in the introduction with some exaggeration as the "rediscovery of the historical Jesus". - It is splendid that this rediscovery of the historical Jesus should have begun within Bultmann's own school.'<sup>7</sup>

1 So, e.g., G. SCHILLE, *NTS* 4, 1957-58, pp. 1f.

2 So G. KLEIN, op. cit., p. 16; Cf. also R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p. 382: 'Some more recent works have taken a positive attitude to form-criticism, and have developed it. Their interest has been directed to the actual composition of the Gospels, in order to determine the historical and theological characteristics of the individual evangelists.'

3 See especially K. L. SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, Literarkritische Untersuchung zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung, Berlin 1919; the subject of this book is the distinction of the oldest Jesus-tradition from the redactional material. Cf. also R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, pp. 337ff.; M. DIBELIUS, *Tradition*, pp. 287ff.

4 Cf. JAMES M. ROBINSON, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, (2nd ed.) London 1961. The contrast is to the famous book by ALBERT SCHWEITZER, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede, (1st Germ. ed. 1906; ET 1910) London 1952. For the origin and the main contributions to this second new trend of NT scholarship see the introduction of ROBINSON's book.

5 Cf. H. RIESENFELD, *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings*, A Study in the Limits of 'Formgeschichte', London 1957, p. 23: 'The beginning of the Gospel tradition lies with Jesus himself.' To this see R. BULTMANN's comment, *Tradition*, p. 381/82.

6 H. ZÄHRNT, *The Historical Jesus* (ET), London 1963, p. 107.

7 *ibid.*, p. 95; the point in the last sentence is that BULTMANN himself condemns the new quest, cf. ZÄHRNT, *ibid.*, pp. 84ff.



A preliminary but nevertheless vital question concerning the new quest is this: What actually began with Jesus of Nazareth? H. RIESENFELD<sup>1</sup> and after him BIRGER GERHARDSSON<sup>2</sup> answered: the 'holy tradition', or, the 'Holy Word' which in the early Church was recited in the course of worship.<sup>3</sup> In spite of some criticism,<sup>4</sup> the research on the Gospel tradition by these two Scandinavian scholars has been called 'a significant step forward'.<sup>5</sup> 'This means', says W. D. DAVIES, 'in our judgment, that they have made it far more historically probable and reasonably credible, over against the scepticism of much form-criticism, that in the Gospels we are within hearing of the authentic voice and within sight of the authentic activity of Jesus of Nazareth, however much muffled and obscured these may be by the process of transmission.'<sup>6</sup> However, we agree with DAVIS that their understanding of the Gospel tradition as a fixed 'holy tradition', or, a 'Holy Word', is not very likely.<sup>7</sup>

J. M. ROBINSON and H. ZAHNT answer the question, What began with Jesus? - by: the 'kerygma'.<sup>8</sup> As far as we can see this answer - which goes back to MARTIN KÄHLER<sup>9</sup> - is common to the whole BULTMANN-school. It implies that the main emphasis of its new quest is on the problems of 'continuity between the Jesus of History and the

1 See H. RIESENFELD, Beginnings.

2 See B. GERHARDSSON, Memory and Manuscript, Oral Tradition and written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity, Uppsala 1961.

3 RIESENFELD *ibid.*, p. 23; GERHARDSSON *ibid.*, pp 202, 335.

4 In addition to BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 381/82 see AMOS N. WILDER, Form-History and Oldest Tradition, and: W. D. DAVIES, Reflections on a Scandinavian Approach to 'The Gospel Tradition', both in: Neotestamentica et Patristica, Eine Freundesgabe, OSCAR CULLMANN, Leiden 1962, resp. pp. 1-13 and 14-34. The latter art. is now reprinted in W. D. DAVIES, Setting, Appendix XV, pp. 464-480.

5 W. D. DAVIES, Setting, p. 480.

6 *ibid.*, p. 480.

7 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 468/69: 'They (sc. other Fathers) know no definitely delineated "tradition", no "Holy Word" undefiled, but a more fluid, living tradition than such a phrase suggests. While the appeal to the Fathers does support Riesenfeld and Gerhardsson in their interpretation of the mode of the transmission of the tradition, it does not seem to us to corroborate their insistence on a fixed 'Holy Word'. Had such existed in so tangible a form as they suggest, it is hardly credible that the struggle with Gnosticism would have been so crucial: that agonistic struggle arose partly because the appeal to "the tradition" was ambiguous.'

8 Cf. J. M. ROBINSON, Quest, p. 94: 'A new quest must be undertaken because the kerygma claims to mediate an existential encounter with a historical person, Jesus, who can also be encountered through the mediation of modern historiography.' - H. ZAHNT, *op. cit.* p. 100/01: 'The Gospels, on the other hand, despite their interpretation from a post-Easter standpoint, are still very much interested in the pre-Easter history of Jesus. They ascribe their kerygma to the earthly Jesus and thus attribute to him a special authority and a permanent significance. For them, therefore, the kerygma is not anonymous. It begins not with a myth or an idea, not with a cult-head or a heavenly being, but with a man. It begins with Jesus of Nazareth.'

9 Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus, (new ed.) München 1953. Cf. H. ZAHNT, *op. cit.*, pp. 82ff.

Christ of proclamation, between Jesus 'preaching before Easter and the preaching of Jesus after Easter.'<sup>1</sup> In the following passage H. ZÄHRNT describes the difficulties and rules of the 'kerygmatic' approach to the historical Jesus: 'In our case, the question of sources presents considerable difficulties in method. We have no formal criteria with which to decide what material derives from the post-Easter faith of the community and what goes back to Jesus himself. Only radical criticism can help us here. - We must begin with the material which has withstood the strictest historical examination. The only primary sources to be considered are the individual traditions, the oldest small units worked out by form criticism, the individual sayings, parables, disputes and miracles, and above all such sayings as reflect an unrepeatable situation. But even these elements of the tradition must in each case be subjected to a critical examination. Here the burden of proof has become greater: we no longer have to prove their unauthenticity, but (and this is far harder) their authenticity. As a general rule, we may assume that the sayings in the Gospels have remained more true to history than the narrative material. The chronological and biographical frameworks into which the individual pieces of tradition have been inserted are the personal compositions of the evangelists and to some extent betray distinct theological aims and tendencies. On the whole we can feel ourselves to be on safe ground where a tradition can be derived neither from a Jewish environment nor from the thought-world of primitive Christianity. There is today general agreement on this basic principle of method.'<sup>2</sup>

This 'kerygmatic' approach to the historical Jesus reminds us of the 'Gnostic's use of words' described by Irenaeus and reported by SAMUEL LAEUCHLI in his recent book 'The Language of Faith':<sup>3</sup> 'For example, in an attack against the Gnostic use of

---

1 H. ZÄHRNT, *ibid.*, p.138; see also J. M. ROBINSON, *Quest.*, pp. 121-125, and esp. R. BULTMANN, *Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus*, (2nd ed.) Heidelberg 1961.

2 H. ZÄHRNT, *op. cit.*, p.107.

3 S. LAEUCHLI, *The Language of Faith*, An Introduction to the Semantic Dilemma of the Early Church, New York 1962, p. 13.



biblical language, Irenaeus of Lyons compared the Gnostic's use of words to the mosaic of a skillful artist which is disarranged by someone else and then reassembled; thus the gems that made the first image now represent something quite different although they are the same gems (*Adversus Haereses* I. 8.1).<sup>1</sup> S. LAEUCHLI explains that we have to do here with 'the fight for a correct mosaic of Christian language. The mosaic is the whole. What makes the whole?'<sup>2</sup>

In the new quest of the historical Jesus we are confronted with a similar question: What makes the whole, viz. the whole historical Jesus?<sup>3</sup> LAEUCHLI's decisive observation and final conclusion about 'canonical language' are these: 'The terminology of the Gospel of Thomas does not differ radically from the terminology of the Synoptic Gospels. If terminology alone had to furnish the criterion between Gnostic and biblical material, we would be confronted with a most chaotic situation. It is not the concept itself which can furnish the answer but only the relation in which it stands to other concepts. A chain of pivotal words determines the core of thought.'<sup>4</sup> - 'Gnostic documents have clarified one issue with perspicuity: "canonical language" cannot be this or that biblical word or formula illuminated by the Spirit. A fundamentalist proof-text linguistic is likewise doomed to fail, exactly as Gnostic arbitrariness fails. ... "Canonical language" demands the search for the centre and the comprehension of the whole. "Canonical language" is only possible in a chain of biblical terminology, never in a catch-word or in a set phrase, but in relation of biblical concepts to each other. It is a frame rather than a list, a barrier as much as a command. This is just what the Greek word *kanon* means: "the mason's riddle line" by which the preacher and the theologian of the Christian Church must measure their speech.'<sup>5</sup>

---

1 S. LAEUCHLI, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

2 *ibid.*, p. 13.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 14: 'The search for the whole is the search for the basic tenor in communication since the whole, the Christ, is constantly preached and received. The problem of Christian language is the first question of Christian faith: "What do you think about Christ?"' - Our own question above, so to speak, asks for the centre of the centre. Cf. also J. M. ROBINSON, *Quest*, p. 95: 'One seeks an encounter with the whole person, comparable to the totality of interpretation one has in the kerygma. ... Rather the whole person is reached through encounter with individual sayings and actions in which Jesus' intention and selfhood are latent. Hence the relation of each saying or scene to the whole would be a problem of constant relevance.'

4 S. LAEUCHLI, *ibid.*, p. 15/16.

5 *ibid.*, p. 91.



Applied to the new quest, this means: If 'small units worked out by form criticism'<sup>1</sup>, or, 'fragments'<sup>2</sup> were the only primary sources we have and thus had to furnish the criterion between the oldest and the redactional material, between Jesus himself and the three 'mosaics' of Jesus contained in the synoptic Gospels, any reassembling of the historical Jesus would be quite arbitrary. The new quest can only succeed if we can detect the 'centre' of the historical Jesus which enables us to comprehend the whole.

Now the question arises, Where can we find the 'centre' of the historical Jesus? R. BULTMANN is right in saying, 'In the case of those who like Jesus have worked through the medium of word, what they purposed can be reproduced only as a group of sayings, of ideas - as teaching. Whoever tries, according to the modern fashion, to penetrate behind the teaching to the psychology or to the personality of Jesus, inevitably, for the reasons already given, misses what Jesus purposed. For his purpose can be comprehended only as teaching.'<sup>3</sup> If Jesus' purpose can be reproduced 'as a group of sayings', 'as teaching', this is the 'place' where we have to look for the 'centre' of the historical Jesus. For although we cannot 'penetrate behind the teaching to the psychology or the personality of Jesus', we can penetrate through the teaching to his original purpose and thus to the essential 'centre' of the historical Jesus himself.

Although it seems that W. D. DAVIES cannot find words adequate to condemn the 'common assumption' that the Sermon on the Mount' can be regarded as a single entity, which has its own unified secret to reveal',<sup>4</sup> we still believe that if there is a group of (authentic) sayings within the synoptic tradition at all, it most probably is found in Mt v-vii.

---

1 H. ZAHNT, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

2 Cf. R. BULTMANN, Jesus and the Word (ET), Fontana Books, London and Glasgow 1958, p. 18: 'It (sc. the oldest layer of the synoptic tradition) meets us as a fragment of tradition coming to us from the past, and in the examination of it we seek the encounter with history.' And also T. W. MANSON, The Sayings of Jesus. As recorded in the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke arranged with Introduction and Commentary, London 1954, p. 12: 'The majority of these people would only have fragments of the whole story; but the tradition is made up by the piecing together of fragments.'

3 R. BULTMANN, Jesus, p. 15.

4 See W. D. DAVIES, Setting, p. 1/2; cf. also p. 416.

The next question, then, is this: What is the k a n o n by which we decide which material of the Sermon on the Mount belongs to the authentic group of sayings through which we can penetrate to the historical Jesus? Of course, this kanon must be derived from the text of the Sermon itself. But how? - In this connection, the following methodological reflections by ALAN RICHARDSON are helpful: 'Those who have reflected little upon the nature of scientific method usually subscribe to the illusion that the scientist collects a lot of facts and that, when he has discovered enough of them, he will find that they are arranged in or conform to an orderly pattern or law. Actually, of course, the reverse is the truth: the scientist, with a flash of insight (some such word is unavoidable here), lights upon his new hypothesis, and t h e n he discovers facts which corroborate it. He s e e s them because now he is looking for them: without the hypothesis - the hunch, the flash, the intuition - he would never have seen them because he would not have known what he was looking for.'<sup>1</sup>

It is perhaps already evident from our previous discussion that we share the basic 'hypothesis' which A. RICHARDSON describes in these words: 'In this book, for instance, the hypothesis is defended that Jesus himself is the author of the brilliant re-interpretation of the Old Testament scheme of salvation ("Old Testament theology") which is found in the New Testament, and that the events of the life, "signs", passion and resurrection of Jesus, as attested by the apostolic witness, can account for the "data" of the New Testament better than any other hypothesis current today.'<sup>2</sup>

This statement is very important for our approach within the new quest. For it suggests that in the authentic group of sayings which perhaps is contained in the Sermon on the Mount we actually have to do with a 're-interpretation of the Old Testament scheme of salvation'. This implies - from our point of view<sup>3</sup> - that the new quest needs a change of emphasis: Not the problems of continuity between the historical Jesus and the Early Church and her kerygma ought to be, methodologically speaking, our primary concern, but rather the problems

---

1 A. RICHARDSON, Theology, p. 10/11.

2 *ibid.*, p. 12

3 We are quite aware of the fact that the implications derived by the author himself are somewhat different from ours, corresponding to his task to write a theology of the NT.



of continuity between the Old Testament scheme of salvation and the historical Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, when we now turn to our first task, namely to frame an hypothesis by means of an investigation into the character of the Sermon on the Mount, we must keep the 'Old Testament scheme of salvation' in our mind, in order to see what we are looking for.

Before we begin with that task, we may sum up the purpose of the present investigation in a few words: It is the main purpose of this study of 'Christian Perfection' to examine the question whether the New Testament teaching concerning this subject originated with Jesus himself, and, if the answer is in the affirmative, to expound, as far as possible, Jesus' own understanding of perfection. Our point of departure is the text of the Sermon on the Mount, of which the saying Mt v.48 about perfection is part, because we believe that Mt v-vii contains a group of authentic sayings. The kanon by which this group can be detected is to be derived from the Sermon itself, which we try to understand against the background of the Old Testament scheme of salvation. Naturally the emphasis of this study is on New Testament exegesis. However, we expect that our interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount not only will throw some new light on much of its materials but, at the same time, give a contribution to the quest of the historical Jesus, i.e. to Christology.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 This obviously is a weak point in the theology of R. BULTMANN. Cf. H. ZÄHRNT, op. cit., p. 93/94: 'Bultmann's concealed existential preconception of history perhaps nowhere becomes clearer than in his understanding of the Old Testament. For him Old Testament history is nothing but a history of failure. True, this leaves him in the happy position of being able to divorce the Christian proclamation completely from history in an existential interpretation, but at a price of losing the connection between the history of Jesus and the history of God's dealings with Israel. Thus the connection between the Old Testament and the New Testament becomes completely incomprehensible.'

2 Cf. GERHARD EBELING, Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus und das Problem der Christologie, p. 24: 'It is impermissible in christology to make any statement about Jesus which does not have its foundation in the historical Jesus and is not limited to expressing who the historical Jesus is.' Ibid., p. 30: 'The task of christology is just that of expressing what was expressed in Jesus himself.' (Quoted from H. ZÄHRNT, op. cit., p. 105).

## THE CHARACTER OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

### 1 The intention of the final redaction

Although New Testament scholarship concerned with synoptic research owes much to the new trend of redaction criticism, the question about the intention of the final redaction, or, in other words, the purpose of the Gospels as a whole, was asked before and independently of it. If we recall the answers given to this question from the 'end of the original quest'<sup>1</sup> to the present, which has been described as 'the midst of ... the "New Quest of the Historical Jesus"',<sup>2</sup> an interesting development can be recognized.

What actually marks the end of the original quest? J. M. ROBINSON is right in saying, 'The Kerygma came gradually to be recognized as the centre not only of the Gospels, but also of primitive Christianity itself. Furthermore it has increasingly come to replace the theological centrality of the "historical Jesus" in leading theological systems of our day. It was this rise of the kerygma to the centre of our understanding of primitive Christianity, and to the normative position in contemporary theology, which was the underlying cause for questioning even the legitimacy of the original quest.'<sup>3</sup>

This is confirmed by the following conclusions of R. BULTMANN's study of the synoptic tradition, which, at the same time, provide an answer to the question about the intention of Mark: 'It is possible to hold that a coherent presentation of the life of Jesus on the basis of a tradition of separate sections and small collections had to come at some time ... But this

---

1 Cf. J. M. ROBINSON, *Quest*, p. 32.

2 Cf. STEPHEN NEILL, Foreword, in: H. ZAHNT, *op. cit.* p.5.

3 J. M. ROBINSON, *ibid.*, p.38/39.

consideration by no means suffices to explain the peculiar character of the Synoptic gospels. Indeed their lack of specifically biographical material, their lacunae in the life story of Jesus are due to their presentation being based on the then extant tradition. But their own specific characteristic, a creation of Mark, can be understood only from the character of the Christian kerygma, whose expansion and illustration the gospels had to serve. The primitive Christian kerygma that grew up on Hellenistic soil is represented by many passages in the Pauline letters, which depend upon the Church Tradition (Rom. 1.3f., 6.3f., 10.9; 1 Cor. 11.23-26, 15.3-7, Phil. 2.6-11), as by the equivalent passages in Acts (2.22-24, 3.13-15, 10.37-41, 13.26-31). The Christ who is preached is not the historic Jesus, but the Christ of the faith and the cult. ... And inevitably the centre of gravity had to be the end of the story, the Passion and Resurrection. Mark was the creator of this sort of Gospel; the Christ myth gives his book, the book of secret epiphanies, not indeed a biographical unity, but an unity based upon the myth of the kerygma.<sup>1</sup>

It is evident from this passage that the character of the Gospels depends on the intention of the evangelists. If they had meant to give a 'life of Jesus', the character of their Gospels would have been historical and biographical. But at the time R. BULTMANN wrote the passage quoted above, K. L. SCHMIDT already had demonstrated conclusively that 'on the whole (im ganzen) there is no life of Jesus in the sense of a developing life-story, no chronological order of the story of Jesus, but only separate stories, pericopae, which are put into a framework.'<sup>2</sup> The intention of Mark - according to BULTMANN - was to present an expansion and illustration of the kerygma of Christ, the unity of which is based upon the 'Christ myth', i.e. 'the Son of God', who 'had suffered, died, risen and been exalted to heavenly glory.'<sup>3</sup> In short, 'the Gospels are expanded cult legends'.<sup>4</sup> Hence, their character is mythological and cultic.

---

1 R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p. 370/71; on BULTMANN's understanding of 'myth' see, e.g., H. P. OWEN, *Revelation and Existence*, A Study in the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann, Cardiff 1957, esp. pp. 1-19 and 151-153.

2 K. L. SCHMIDT, *Rahmen*, p. 317.

3 *ibid.*, p. 371.

4 *ibid.*, p. 371.



The discovery of the kerygma as the centre of primitive Christianity was taken up and worked out also by C. H. DODD.<sup>1</sup> For our present context, two of his original contributions are of special interest. First, DODD attempted to refute K. L. SCHMIDT's conclusions about the non-chronological order of the Gospels and to unite the summaries ('Sammelberichte') into a chronological outline of the ministry of Jesus.<sup>2</sup> No one would wish to deny the relevance of this attempt for the new quest, although it was hardly successful.<sup>3</sup> Second, DODD insisted upon a sharp distinction between kerygma and didache: 'This order of approach, first the proclamation, then the beginning of instruction in morals, first kerygma, then didache, seems to have been thoroughly characteristic of the Christian mission; it is precisely this order, first kerygma, then didache, which we have seen to be general in the New Testament writings.'<sup>4</sup> Consequently, he says, e.g., 'Matthew is, in fact, no longer in the pure sense a "Gospel"'. It combines kerygma with didache, and if we regard the book as a whole, the element of didache predominates.<sup>5</sup>

The great influence of C. H. DODD's understanding of the kerygma is unquestionable.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, T. W. MANSON holds a similar view, when he says 'Historic Christianity is first and foremost a Gospel, the proclamation to the world of Jesus Christ and Him crucified. For the primitive Church the central thing is the Cross on the Hill rather than the Sermon on the Mount ... What is preached in the first instance is something that God has done for man in Christ. Only when this has been appropriated does the question arise how we are to think of the God who has done this great thing, or how we are now to order our lives as Christians.'<sup>7</sup> While T. W. MANSON rejects the definition of the teaching of Jesus as 'a new

---

1 See C. H. DODD, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments, London 1936.

2 See C. H. DODD, The Framework of the Gospel Narrative (article originally 1932), now in C. H. DODD, New Testament Studies, Manchester 1953, pp. 1ff.

3 Cf. J. M. ROBINSON, Quest, pp. 48-58.

4 C. H. DODD, Gospel and Law, The Relation of Faith and Ethics in Early Christianity, New York 1951, p. 10.

5 C. H. DODD, Preaching, p. 121.

6 Cf., e.g., A. M. HUNTER, The Unity of the New Testament, (5th impr.) London 1957; p. 22; A. RICHARDSON, Theology, p. 24/25.

7 T. W. MANSON, Sayings, p. 9.

Law',<sup>1</sup> he nevertheless insists on a clear separation between the Gospel and the sayings: 'They did not constitute the Gospel. The Gospel meant primarily the story of the Passion and the Resurrection.'<sup>2</sup> '... they were needed in the pastoral work, which followed necessarily on any successful missionary effort.'<sup>3</sup>

It is perhaps the influence of both C. H. DODD and T. W. MANSON which led to the following verdict on Matthew and Luke: 'But the pattern (sc. of the kerygma) is not so clear as in St. Mark; for in St. Matthew and St. Luke the kerygma has, so to speak, been mixed with didache, namely, "Q", and the special teaching preserved in the special sources which we call "M" and "L". The inclusion of this new material inevitably blurs somewhat the outline of the kerygma.'<sup>4</sup> At this point, the question as to the actual intention, or, purpose of the Gospels became inevitable.

A first answer was given by R. V. TASKER, in his 'unpretentious little book' entitled 'The Nature and purpose of the Gospels'.<sup>5</sup> In fact, TASKER's approach - at least to a certain extent - is already that characteristic of the new trend of redaction criticism. It is worth noting that he does not set 'redaction' over against 'tradition',<sup>6</sup> or 'interpretation' over against 'tradition',<sup>7</sup> but rather 'interpretation' over against 'fact'.<sup>8</sup> His first chapter contains the following sentences, which both link up with the views expressed earlier by C. H. DODD and

---

1 Cf. T. W. MANSON, Sayings, p. 10: 'The teaching of Jesus was not given as a new Law, yet it did at many points touch both the written Law and the scribal tradition.'

2 *ibid.*, p. 10.

3 *ibid.*, p. 9; cf. also p. 10: 'We have thus four motives at work in the compilation of the teaching: the pastoral care of the churches, the personal interest of the disciples in the Master, the apologetic value of such teaching in the Gentile world, and the need of the Palestinian community to defend itself against the charge of uttering subversive doctrines.'

4 A. M. HUNTER, The Unity of the New Testament, (1st ed. 1943, 5th impr.) London 1957, p. 27.

5 (1st ed. 1944, 7th impr.) London 1962.

6 So, e.g. H. RIESENFELD, Tradition und Redaktion im Markusevangelium.

7 So, e.g., G. BORNKAMM, etc., Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew.

8 *ibid.*, Preface, p. 7.

T. W. MANSON, and, at the same time, correct them: 'The truth is that both sets of documents (sc. Paul's Epistles and the Gospels) are united by the gospel, but the gospel is a proclamation of the life as well as the death and Resurrection of the Saviour; ...'.<sup>1</sup> The Gospels 'are first and foremost records of certain deeds and sayings which are pregnant with meaning because they are the very deeds of God Himself wrought in the human life and death of Him Whom a body of men regarded as their Lord and Master.'<sup>2</sup>

Mark's purpose - according to R. V. G. TASKER - was to present the gospel, and that not as 'a purely objective, disinterested account of the life of Jesus, but a setting forth in narrative form of the gospel as it was preached by the Christian Church. The story hangs together because of this.'<sup>3</sup> The difference between Mark and Matthew is only a matter of emphasis. 'The aim of Matthew was ... to present it in such a manner as would render it very serviceable for reading in church and for instructional purpose; ...'.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, Matthew elaborated what was implicit in Mark, namely the continuity between the Old and the New Covenant: 'The great theme of his book is: "Jesus has fulfilled Jewish prophecy."'<sup>5</sup> Finally, we may quote TASKER's observation about the section Mt ix.36 - x.42: '... instructions which are here recorded, not primarily because the Evangelist has a historical interest in that mission, but because they are of value to Christian missionaries always.'<sup>6</sup>

The first major work of redaction criticism about Matthew, i.e. KRISTER STENDAHL, 'The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament',<sup>7</sup> elaborates the theme already indicated by R. V. G. TASKER. STENDAHL's central thesis is, 'Thus the Matthean School must be understood as a school for teachers and church leaders, and for this reason the literary work of that school assumes the form of a manual for teaching and administration within the church. As we shall see, the Matthean type of midrashic interpretation is not principally the halakic or the haggadic one favoured by the rabbinic schools, but it closely approaches

---

1 R. V. G. TASKER, *op. cit.*, p.14.

2 *ibid.*, p. 20.

3 *ibid.*, p. 32.

4 *ibid.*, p. 35.

5 *ibid.*, p. 35.

6 *ibid.*, p. 36.

7 Uppsala 1954.



what has been called the midrash pesher of the Qumran Sect, in which the O. T. texts were not primarily the sources of rules, but the prophecy which was shown to be fulfilled.<sup>1</sup>

In a recent article entitled 'The Intention of the Evangelists', C. F. D. MOULE on the whole arrives at the same conclusions as his predecessors quoted above. 'Then what of Mark?' he asks, and gives the answer: 'The most significant fact about it, for the present inquiry, is simply its contents, which are not only within the framework of the κήρυγμα but are themselves in the nature of κήρυγμα; and κήρυγμα is primarily the "propaedeutic" for the outsider. ... it is the preaching that is primarily the content of Mark; the κήρυγμα for unbelievers.'<sup>2</sup> In the final statement of the article, this answer is somewhat modified: '... Matthew and Mark were both intended chiefly as instruction for Christians, though in order to familiarize them with what they needed as equipment for their evangelistic witness to the outsiders; while John and Luke were meant as tracts, to be placed directly in the hands of individual readers representing outside inquirers of different types.'<sup>3</sup>

The newer tendency in the development concerning the views about the intention of the evangelists and the character of their Gospels, which we tried to sketch in the present section beginning with R. BULTMANN via C. H. DODD to the present time, is expressed well by H. G. WOOD. Referring first to BULTMANN's view,<sup>4</sup> he says, '... I am disposed to think that the Didache and the Kerygma have been too rigidly separated, that some elements of the teaching of Jesus may have been incorporated in the Christological Kerygma from the first, and that the taking up of the sayings of the Lord into the gospel, while it may well have

1 K. STENDAHL, *Matthew*, p. 35.

2 C. F. D. MOULE, in: A. J. B. HIGGINS (ed.), *New Testament Essays*, Studies in Memory of T. W. MANSON, Manchester 1959, p. 169.

3 *ibid.*, p. 170.

4 See R. BULTMANN, *Theology I*, p. 86: 'The reason that sayings of the Lord, which at first were handed down separately from the christological kerygma, came more and more to be taken up into "the gospel" (in Mark still sparingly, whereas Matthew and Luke combine the kerygma and the tradition of Jesus' sayings into a unity) is that, while missionary preaching continued, preaching to Christian congregations took on ever-increasing importance and for these already believing congregations, Jesus in the role of "teacher" had become more important again.' Cf. also C. H. DODD, *Preaching*, p. 127: 'We are not to think of the record in the Gospels as the ultimate raw material, out of which the preaching was constructed. The kerygma is primary, and it acted as a preservative of the tradition which conveyed the facts. The nearer we are in the Gospels to the stuff of the kerygma, the nearer we are to the fountain-head of the tradition.'

been desirable in preaching to Christian congregations, was discovered to be an element of increasing importance in missionary preaching.<sup>1</sup> - 'Didache and Kerygma together make up Evangelion.'<sup>2</sup>

If we agree on this point, we realise at once that the vital question remains as yet unanswered, namely: What is the relationship between kerygma and didache, or, in other words, between the gospel (kerygma) and the (synoptic) Gospels? In two articles, GOTTFRIED SCHILLE offered a very interesting answer to this question, which - as far as we can see - has not yet received the attention it deserves.<sup>3</sup> In his first article, SCHILLE questions the validity of the form critical axiom 'that the Gospels are collections of materials transmitted in preaching.'<sup>4</sup> He finds reasons for the following threefold distinction within the kerygma: 'In the future, one will have to differentiate between kerygma and kerygma, depending whether it is missionary, catechetical, or remembering, intended for gentiles, catechumens, or baptized members of the congregation.'<sup>5</sup> This implies that we have to reckon with three different 'kerygmatic' materials in the Gospels, which we may identify roughly with (1) illustrations, such as parables, healings and surprising stories, (2) teaching, which covers the whole content of faith and answers concrete questions about teaching matter, and (3) the Passion narrative, including the institution of the Lord's Supper, and further materials related to baptism. Now the question arises: Does any one of these groups of kerygmatic materials dominate in the Gospels, and thus impress its specific character on the whole?<sup>6</sup>

---

1 H. G. WOOD, Didache, Kerygma and Evangelion, in: NT Essays, p. 306.

2 *ibid.*, p. 312; cf. also H. RIESENFELD, Tradition und Redaktion, p. 162, who holds that the teaching of Jesus is 'firmly anchored in the primitive materials of the tradition'.

3 Cf. G. SCHILLE, Bemerkungen zur Formgeschichte des Evangeliums. (I) Rahmen und Aufbau des Markus-Evangeliums, in: NTS IV, 1957-58, pp. 1-24, and II. Das Evangelium des Matthäus als Katechismus, *ibid.*, pp. 101-114.

4 *ibid.*, p. 11.

5 *ibid.*, p. 13.

6 See *ibid.*, p. 13ff., IV. Jesus als Lehrer; on p. 23 SCHILLE recalls the note by Papias which says that Mark worked as a catechist.



G. SCHILLE concludes 'that Mark solved the problem posed by catechetics, to write a Gospel, presumably especially by catechetical means, in that he demonstrated the origin of the teaching of the Church in the work of Jesus: Jesus came into the world in order to bring to "the Twelve" the "new teaching with authority", which according to their own declaration is "received from the Lord". Mark uses for his outline the scheme of the homology and for its expansion the secret "teaching" of the Church, which he probably revised according to the requirements of a Christological report and enriched with motifs of other origins.<sup>1</sup>

The key to Matthew, who follows and elaborates Mark's line of approach, is - according to G. SCHILLE, and before him O. MICHEL<sup>2</sup> - Mt xxviii. 18-20:

And Jesus came and said to them,

"All authority in heaven and on earth  
has been given to me.

Go therefore and make disciples (*μαθητεύσατε*) of all nations,  
baptizing them in the name of the Father  
and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,  
teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you;  
and lo, I am with you always,

to the close of the age.

From this commission the intention of the final redaction<sup>3</sup> of Matthew is clear: 'The evangelist offers to the missionary a sort of handbook for the execution of the commission to the disciples. He writes his work in the form of a catechism.'<sup>4</sup>

If Matthew's Gospel actually is written in the form of a catechism, or, of didache, what, then, is the relationship between kerygma and didache?

---

1 G. SCHILLE, *ibid.*, p. 24.

2 Cf. *ibid.* (art II.) p. 113, n. 3.

3 We use the term 'redaction' and not 'redactor', or, 'evangelist', because we believe - with K. STENDAHL, cf. *op. cit.* - that the final redaction of Matthew is the work of a 'school', or Church-body, rather than the work of an individual person.

4 G. SCHILLE, *ibid.*, p. 113.

G. SCHILLE's suggestion that we should speak about the type of the 'learnt gospel' rather than of 'catechism' points to a surprising answer, namely: The relationship between kerygma and didache is that between the 'preached' and the 'learnt gospel'.<sup>1</sup> This implies that kerygma and didache differ in form only but not in content. Thus, C. H. DODD's observation concerning the character of the Christian mission is correct in this sense: first kerygma, i.e. missionary preaching, then didache, i.e. a résumé of the kerygma.<sup>2</sup>

For the type of the 'learnt gospel' in the early Church, G. SCHILLE refers to the following passages in the Epistles:<sup>3</sup> Eph iv.20: 'You did not so learn (ἐμάθετε) Christ: - assuming that you have heard about him and were taught (ἐδιδάχθητε) in him, as the truth is in Jesus.' - Col i. 5b-7a: 'Of this you have heard before in the word of truth, the gospel (τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) which has come to you, as indeed in the whole world it is bearing fruit and growing - so among yourselves, from the day you heard and understood the grace of God in truth, as you learned (ἐμάθετε) it from Epaphras our beloved fellow servant.' - 'The "ministers of Christ" (Lk-prologue "ministers of the word")', SCHILLE explains, 'bring to the congregations, as Epaphras did to the Colossians, "the gospel" and apparently let them "learn" that or a résumé of it, before baptism "seals the hope" (Eph i. 13f.; Hb vi. 13ff.), which was "made known" to them before, Christ raised to the right hand of God (Col i.27; iii. 3f.).'<sup>4</sup>

Two things are evident from these texts: (1) the type of the 'learnt gospel' existed before Mark, and (2) the sayings of Jesus might belong to this type. Now, the question arises, Why did Mark omit most of the sayings found in the other two synoptics? SCHILLE answers, '... the earliest evangelist concentrated almost entirely on the more important secret teaching and therefore omitted the antebaptismal materials. Matthew breaks through this restriction

---

1 Cf. G. SCHILLE, *ibid.*, p. 105.

2 This is, of course, a simplification of this problem. But it is supposed to be a provisional statement only, to which we shall return in due time.

3 See *ibid.*, p. 105/06.

4 *ibid.*, p. 106; the expressions in German do not correspond exactly with the English of the RSV.

into a completely new field, in so far as the Gospel from being a publication for the baptized members of the congregation now becomes a book of the missionary-Church.<sup>1</sup>

It is not surprising that G. SCHILLE applies his thesis first of all to Mt v-vii. He asks, is 'the Sermon on the Mount a report of the early-Christian baptismal speech?'<sup>2</sup> If this is so, the well known difficulty of explaining the difference between Matthew's and Luke's version of the Sermon would find a ready solution: 'That Luke scatters the logia can be interpreted as the practice of the missionary during the proclamation of his message, while Matthew can offer a Sermon on the Mount because, immediately before baptism, the missionary tends to compose the scattered logia into a baptismal speech.'<sup>3</sup>

In his second article, G. SCHILLE proceeds to test his thesis by way of a comparison of the structure and content of the Sermon with 'The Didache'.<sup>4</sup> The catechetical character of the Sermon on the Mount and its parallels to the latter document have been recognised too by the following scholars: G. BORNKAMM,<sup>5</sup> C. H. DODD,<sup>6</sup> J. JEREMIAS,<sup>7</sup> and - to a certain extent - by W. D. DAVIES.<sup>8</sup> In view of the common opinion of at least four scholars - W. D. DAVIES not included - there is no need for us to go into the question of the catechetical character of the Sermon more deeply at this point, in order to present the evidence anew.

---

1 G. SCHILLE, *ibid.*, p. 107.

2 *ibid.*, p. 107.

3 *ibid.*, p. 107.

4 See *ibid.*, pp. 107-110.

5 Cf. End-expectation and Church in Matthew's Gospel, (originally in *TLZ* 79, 1954, pp. 341-6, and, worked out, in: The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology, Studies in Honour of C. H. DODD, 1956, pp. 222-69), now in: G. BORNKAMM, Matthew (op. cit.) p.16/17.

6 Cf. The Primitive Catechism and the Sayings of Jesus, in: NT Essays, p. 111.

7. Cf. The Sermon on the Mount. (The Ethel M. Wood Lecture delivered before the University of London on 7 March 1961), esp. pp. 20-24.

8 Cf. Setting, p. 8: 'Matthew has transformed what we may loosely call a "sermonic scene" to a didactic one, in which Jesus suggests a rabbi giving his Torah to his talmidim.' - In Appendix XII, 'The influence of Catechisms on the Gospels', W. D. DAVIES discusses C. H. DODD's article mentioned above (cf. n. 6.) and admits, '... it is also possible to endorse the parallelism drawn between the structure of Matthew's SM and catechesis, although another interpretation of it would seem to be equally, if not more, illuminating (see pp. 304ff. above), while it is significant that neither Dodd nor Carrington can account for all the material in the Sermon on the Mount in catechetical terms (see Carrington, op. cit.).'



We may, then, provisionally adopt G. SCHILLE's thesis about Matthew and formulate it for our purpose as follows: The Gospel according to Matthew is a sort of hand-book of the missionary-Church, which helps her to be obedient to her calling amidst the nations, and which contains above all materials from the catechetical tradition. The Sermon on the Mount is a typical example for this kind of materials, and its character may be defined accordingly as catechetical, and that in the sense of 'learned gospel'.



## 2 The place and structure of the Sermon on the Mount in the synoptic tradition

In the previous section we looked at the intention of the final redaction of Matthew in writing his Gospel as we find it in the discussion of the synoptic tradition from R. BULTMANN onwards, and finally adopted the newer view as formulated by G. SCHILLE. It is important, at this point, to spend a little time in examining the question of the source(s) of the Sermon on the Mount.

In the 'Introductory' chapter of his comprehensive book about the setting of the Sermon on the Mount, W. D. DAVIES sums up his point of departure in this matter. 'Matt. v-vii is', he insists, 'made up of material drawn from diverse sources, which can fairly easily be isolated and can be seen tabulated in any handbook on the Gospels. The needs of the Church have dictated, if not created, much of the form and possibly much of the content of the material.'<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, DAVIES holds Matthew to be 'No unimaginative compiler or slavish editor, ... (but) a formulator of the tradition, concerned to present it in a specific way to meet the needs of his Church as he understood them. And in the light of this we must insist that Matthew, the final author of the Gospel, did himself regard v-vii as a unit.'<sup>2</sup>

With this we may compare the view expressed by GERHARD GLOEGE: 'The Sermon on the Mount recorded in Matthew (Matt. 5-7) is a free composition of the evangelist or the circle concealed behind his name. ... Luke has incorporated substantial portions of Matt. 5 and 7 in his "Sermon on the Plain" (Luke 6.20-49). In addition, there are parts of the Sermon on the Mount scattered throughout Luke 11-14 and 16. Correspondences with Mark are rare

---

1 W. D. DAVIES, Setting, p. 4.

2 ibid., p. 13.

Matthew worked from the same source as Luke, therefore, but grouped the sayings differently.<sup>1</sup>

If the thesis adopted at the end of our previous section is correct, its implications can be formulated in three points, namely: (1) the materials of the Sermon stem not from diverse sources but from the catechetical tradition; (2) this tradition most probably transmitted the materials already in some sort of what we may provisionally call 'catechetical sequence'; (3) it underlies all three synoptic Gospels.

To a certain extent these three points link up with the findings of P. CARRINGTON and E. G. SELWYN, namely, that there was a 'pre-literary Christian catechism',<sup>2</sup> and that common catechetical and liturgical sources underlie most of the Epistles of N.T.<sup>3</sup> In a recent article, J. P. BROWN adopted these findings and adapted them as follows: 'For our purpose we may think of the Catechism as one traditional edition of Q.'<sup>4</sup>

Of course, we cannot discuss 'The Synoptic Problem' in the present study. The relevant point here is the influence of the new trend of redaction criticism on this problem, which may be defined in two statements: (a) we now are fairly certain about the redactional, or editorial, materials of the Gospels; (b) it is no longer possible to differentiate strictly between materials from the common written source, i.e. the hypothetical document Q', and teaching-materials peculiar either to Matthew or Luke.<sup>5</sup>

Returning to the Sermon on the Mount, this means above all: the 'M-hypothesis' is no more tenable; Matthew worked from the same source as Luke' (G. GLOEGE). In this connection it is worth noting how VINCENT TAYLOR concluded his article about 'The Original Order of "Q"' in 1959. 'It is desirable', he said, 'that M should be investigated more closely.

1 G. GLOEGE, The Day of His Coming, The Man in the Gospels (ET), London 1963, p. 208.

2 P. CARRINGTON, The Primitive Christian Catechism, A Study in the Epistles, Cambridge 1940, p. 88.

3 E. G. SELWYN, The First Epistle of St. Peter, (1st ed. 1946) London 1955, p. 459.

4 J. P. BROWN, Synoptic Parallels in the Epistles, in: NTS, Vol. 10 (October 1963), No. 1, pp. 27-48; cit. p. 28. Cf. T. HENSHAW, New Testament Literature, London 1963, p. 67: 'Q, however, is principally concerned with the "teaching" of the converted. It has been conjectured that it was a manual of instruction in the meaning of discipleship for newly converted members of the Christian Church.'

5 With these two statements cf. G. STRECKER, op. cit., pp. 10-14.

This task has been waiting for a generation, and it will always prove difficult, since the M sayings are found in Matt. only.<sup>1</sup>

The task mentioned by TAYLOR was carried out by J. P. BROWN in an article entitled 'The Form of "Q" known by Matthew.'<sup>2</sup> Concerning Matthew's special materials (M), BROWN suggests the following division into three groups, viz.: (1) supplements to the Marcan narrative, (2) the parables, and (3) sayings similar in kind to Q, i.e. the M-materials proper.<sup>3</sup> He holds that 'there must be a literary relation between M and Q', and returns to T. W. MANSON's rejected 'Proto-Matthew' hypothesis: 'M, then, would be just a series of additions to Q, and the stemma becomes  $Q \rightarrow (Q + M = Q^{mt}) \rightarrow \text{Matthew}$ '.<sup>4</sup> The 'great point' - according to BROWN - is that after rejecting (1) and (2) as oral tradition, the proper M-materials stand 'with the slightest exceptions ... in a Q-context'.<sup>5</sup> His final conclusion is this: 'The M-sayings came to Matthew already combined with Q in a larger sayings-document  $Q^{mt}$ '.<sup>6</sup>

After this conclusion J. P. BROWN proceeds, 'This proposal still apparently leaves open the possibility that the M-sayings are parts of original Q omitted by Luke. In fact, since Luke includes some Q-materials omitted by Matthew (I would propose Luke vi. 27b-28a, 34, 37b-38a; ix. 61-2; xii. 35-7, 47-50; xv. 8-10; xvii. 29-9), the opposite also should be true. Such sayings as those of the offending member (Matt. v 29-30), the second mile (v. 41), the morrow (vi. 34), the camel (xxiii. 24), surely authentic and solidly embedded in Q, might have been omitted by Luke because of what he considered their un-Hellenic hyperbole.'<sup>7</sup>

But this possibility is immediately rejected by BROWN: '... for most of the M-materials there is some good reason, literary or historical, which precludes this. For example, the M-sermon of Matt. v-vii with its neat triads is a foreign element in Luke vi. 20-49, which throughout has a pattern of three short elements and a longer one. And in general we can repeat the analysis which

---

1 V. TAYLOR, The Original Order of 'Q', in: NT Essays, p. 267.

2 in: NTS, Vol. VIII, 1961-62, pp. 27-42.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 23/29.

4 *ibid.*, p. 31; cf. T. W. MANSON, Sayings, pp. 21-26

5 *ibid.*, p. 32.

6 *ibid.*, p. 33.

7 *ibid.*, p. 33.



has persuaded many, and from which we began, that Q is to be found almost entire in Luke.<sup>1</sup>

J. P. BROWN is quite right: 'Since Harnack, reconstructions of Greek Q have substantially adhered to Luke's order and content, and assumed only that Luke has made frequent stylistic changes in a more original wording preserved by Matthew.'<sup>2</sup> However, this is merely a hypothesis which rests on the assumption that 'Luke's treatment of Mark and Q' was 'very similar: retention of original order, stylistic smoothing ...'.<sup>3</sup> How are we to know that 'original Q' is 'luckily preserved in Luke alone',<sup>4</sup> and that Jesus' sayings 'have undergone catechetical interpretation in all cases except (happily for the historian :) the Gospel of Luke'?<sup>5</sup>

There are two reasons why we believe that the M-sayings - as far as they are not editorial - are parts of original Q and, therefore, that Matthew preserves not only a more original wording but also a more original order of the common catechetical source than Luke. First, it sounds impossible that Luke can retain the original order both of Mark and of Q. If the orders of these two documents are not exactly identical, Luke must either follow Mark and decompose Q, or vice versa. As we have seen above, G. SCHILLE's thesis points to the first possibility: Luke follows Mark and scatters the sayings contained in the Sermon on the Mount, while Matthew 'decomposes' Mark's order<sup>6</sup> and retains the resume-form of the Sermon. The fact that the outlines of the synoptic Gospels on the whole are still similar seems to suggest that Mark was aware of the structure of the common catechetical tradition when he composed his Gospel.

Second, J. P. BROWN's hypothesis that the original Q was preserved in Luke alone implies that 'Q is allowed to have had an extensive history of additions and reworking before

---

1 J. P. BROWN, 'Q'.. p. 33.

2 *ibid.*, p. 27.

3 *ibid.*, p. 27.

4 *ibid.*, p. 38.

5 J. P. BROWN, *Parallels*, p. 48.

6 Cf. G. SCHILLE, art. II, p. 110, (i) Die Dekomposition des Marc.-Rahmens im Matthäus-Evangelium.

it came to Matthew.<sup>1</sup> Of course we cannot exclude additions and reworking in the case of a catechetical tradition. But the difficulty is that the M-materials which are supposed to be 'added to Q along Matthew's branch of the Q-tradition' are materials 'with some Jewish-Christian bias'.<sup>2</sup> On this point, B. C. BUTLER is right in saying, 'Either then our Lord preached a Sermon on this theme (sc. the duty of charity), which Matthew expanded, "Judaized" (i.e. set back into a Jewish thought-world and made relevant to Palestinian controversies), and so transformed into a quasi-original Christian manifesto; or St Luke has transformed a sermon of the latter type into a shorter one on a more generalized theme, Butler argues, 'Not only does the former solution offend against what we may call the historical law of entropy (it involves putting back the clock of history and an inversion of the principle of historical development)' and then proceeds to test seven indications of its falsity.<sup>3</sup> Our conclusion here is not that Luke is directly dependent on the Matthean Sermon,<sup>4</sup> but - as mentioned already - that Matthew and Luke are dependent on the same catechetical document, to which the final redaction of Matthew may have added further sayings from the oral tradition, while Luke scattered some of the sayings from that document and most probably omitted those with a 'Jewish-Christian bias'.

In short, our hypothesis is that the original 'Sermon' of the catechetical document is preserved unaltered neither in Matthew nor in Luke; however, because it depends on the same document, it can be reconstructed by way of a comparison between Matthew's and Luke's version, and that most successfully if we follow the structure of the Matthean Sermon. Before we proceed to test this hypothesis, which we shall do only provisionally in this section, we turn to the question of the place of the Sermon in the synoptic tradition, in order to find out whether Matthew and Luke actually report the same 'Sermon', and whether it was known to Mark as well.

---

1 J. P. BROWN, 'Q', p. 33.

2 *ibid.*, p. 33.

3 B. C. BUTLER, The Originality of St. Matthew, A Critique of The Two-Document Hypothesis, Cambridge 1951, p. 46/47.

4 So B. C. BUTLER, *ibid.*, p. 48.

One of the more obvious differences between Mark and the other synoptics is the absence of the Sermon on the Mount in the former. However, this is a problem only for those who doubt the normal Q hypothesis.<sup>1</sup> LÉON VAGANAY, for example, starts his investigation with Mt v. 1-2, which he calls 'the historical introduction to the Sermon on the Mount'.<sup>2</sup> From this passage he proceeds to Mark iii. 13, where he finds the same elements as in the Matthean introduction, and as well in Lk vi. 12-13a. Is there any connection between these three passages? VAGANAY is right in saying that this question must be answered by an examination of the wider context.<sup>3</sup> His conclusion is 'that Mt - Mk - Lk knew the same anterior context of the historical introduction of the great inaugural discourse of Jesus'.<sup>4</sup>

We now examine the same problem in our own way, in order to test our hypothesis and to answer some concrete questions. In spite of L. VAGANAY's designation of Mt v. 1-2, it is not very likely that this introduction as a whole is 'historical'. The very first words, 'Seeing the crowds, he went up on the mountain' (1a), seem to suggest that Jesus withdraws in order to speak to his disciples in private.<sup>5</sup> According to Mt vii. 28-29, however, the crowds are present at the end of the Sermon, expressing their astonishment at Jesus' teaching. This contradiction is to be explained by the observation that Mt vii 28b-29 stems from the pericope Mk i. 21-22 Lk iv. 31-32, whereas in vii. 28a we have to do with a stereotyped editorial formula (cf. xi. 1, xiii. 53, ix. 1, xxvi. 1). Over against Luke, Matthew omitted the incident Mk i. 21 altogether. Hence we may conclude that as a conclusion to the Sermon Mt vii. 28-29 is editorial, and consequently that the common source did not contain such a conclusion.

Did the common source contain an introduction to the Sermon? The structure of the Matthean context of v-vii is - according to K. L. SCHMIDT - evident from the summary

---

1 Cf. L. VAGANAY, L'absence du Sermon sur la montagne chez Marc, RB 1951, LVIII, pp. 5-46, and the main work by the same author, Le problème synoptique. Une hypothèse de travail, Paris 1954.

2 L'absence, p. 6.

3 Cf. ibid., p. 6/7.

4 ibid., p. 9.

5 See to this and the following K. L. SCHMIDT, Rahmen, pp. 69-71.



(Sammelbericht) iv. 23-25: (1) the teaching of Jesus, v-vii, (2) the healing of Jesus, viii. ix. This scheme enables us to recognise the exact point where the final redaction of Matthew inserts the Sermon on the Mount, as compared with the Markan outline, namely between Mk i.39 and i. 40: 'And he went through all Galilee, preaching ( κηρύσσων ) in their synagogues and casting out demons.' / 'And a leper came to him beseeching him, and kneeling said to him, "If you will, you can make me clean." ' This is confirmed by the fact that Mk i.40 is reported in Matthew right after the Sermon, namely in Mt viii. 2, to which it is joined by the editorial verse viii. 1.

Mark's order after i.40 has a connected grouping of five stories in ii. 1-iii. 6. The common theme of these stories is Jesus' conflict with the Pharisees. 'These opponents, so to speak, hold the whole together.'<sup>1</sup> Mk iii. 7-12 is an editorial summary. Mark's point is this: everywhere in Palestine the people are deeply impressed by Him Who - nota bene - is 'the Son of God' (11). By connecting the stories in ii. 1-iii. 6, with iii. 7-12, Mark depicts a contrast: while the Pharisees reject, the people accept Jesus. The passage iii. 13-19 must be understood against this background: it is from the people Jesus chooses his disciples.<sup>2</sup>

Is Mk iii. 13 a parallel to Mt v. 1-2 as indicated by L. VAGANAY? K. L. SCHMIDT denies this, against SPITTA.<sup>3</sup> We have seen already that the final redaction of Matthew does not insert the Sermon after Mk iii. 13 but after i. 39. What about Luke? Our assumption is that Luke follows the Markan outline more closely than Matthew. If there was an introduction to the Sermon in the common source which mentions 'the mountain', Mk iii. 13 certainly must have caught his eye. And he must have realised that there was something wrong with Mk iii.13ff. L. VAGANAY made the following observation: '... in the synoptics, for nineteen occurrences of προσκαλεῖται, there is only one where Jesus calls somebody to himself without uttering words. This happens in Mark, iii. 13, in the historical introduction to the Sermon on the Mount.'<sup>4</sup>

1 K. L. SCHMIDT, *Rahmen*, p. 103; SCHMIDT concludes from this, 'He (sc. Mark), therefore, is likely to have found the arrangement of the stories ii. 1 - iii. 6.'

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 107.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 109, n. 2; however, SCHMIDT's judgment is based on the Markan and Q-hypothesis, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 15-17.

4 L. VAGANAY, *L'absence*, p. 20.

To VAGANAY's observation we may add the point that Mk iii. 14-15 is likely to be not only an anticipation of Mk. vi. 7 but an incident which originally, i.e. in Mark's source, belongs to the 'Sending Out of the Twelve', Mk vi. 7-13. K. L. SCHMIDT holds the 'Call of the Twelve' to be unhistorical: 'In fact, the whole is a list without soul.'<sup>1</sup> This seems to be confirmed by Matthew, who does not report a 'Call' apart from the 'Sending Out of the Twelve', Mt x. 1ff. Hence it follows, we believe, that Mark omitted the 'Sermon' contained in the catechetical source - perhaps, as G. SCHILLE suggested, because he wanted to concentrate on the 'secret teaching' - , filling up the gap with a 'Call of the Twelve'.<sup>2</sup>

If this interpretation is accepted, Luke's editorial activities become quite clear: understanding the inconsistency of Mark's pericope iii. 13-19 correctly, he inserts his report on the 'Sermon' here, or, to be more precise, after Mk iii. 6, composing his whole passage Lk vi. 12-20a in a way which makes it an introduction to the Sermon. This is to say, Luke first tells a real story about the 'Call', thereby putting Mark's list of the Twelve in a meaningful setting. In order to get a logical sequence, namely, a development a minori ad maius, Luke interchanges the order of the Markan text (cf. Lk vi. 12-16/Mk iii. 13-19 - Lk vi. 17-19// Mk iii. 7-12), and thus depicts a threefold circle of hearers of the Sermon: (1) The Twelve Apostles, (2) the wider circle of disciples, and (3) a great multitude of people. We may assume, then, that Luke placed the elements of the original introduction contained in the common catechetical source in two separated verses, and join them again in the following arrangement of the three parallel passages Mk iii. 13 // Mt v. 1-2 // Lk vi. 12, 20.

---

1 K. L. SCHMIDT, Rahmen, p. 111.

2 Thus we hold that the symbolical number 'Twelve' played a role and, most probably, first occurred in the common source, in the 'Sending Out of the Twelve', while the 'Call' is the product of Mark's difficulty connected with his omitting of the Sermon. The way Mark handled this case we believe, is clear evidence for the existence of an important discourse in the catechetical tradition, to which he had to refer (cf. προσκαλεσται, iii. 13) even if he omitted it, and that because his readers must have known about it as well. On the 'Twelve' see now G. KLEIN, Die Zwölf Apostel, Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee, Göttingen 1961; KLEIN's thesis is that the idea of the 'Twelve Apostles' was Luke's 'invention'. There is truth in this, in our view only in so far as Luke elaborated this idea considerably.



Mk iii. 13:

And he went up  
into the hills,  
(καὶ ἀναβαίνει  
εἰς τὸ ὄρος)  
and called to him  
those whom he desired;

and they came to him.

(καὶ προσῆλθον  
πρὸς αὐτόν)

Mt v. 1-2:

Seeing the crowds,  
he went up  
on the mountain,  
(ἀνέβη  
εἰς τὸ ὄρος)  
and when he sat down  
his disciples

(οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ)

came to him.

(προσῆλθον αὐτῷ)

And he opened his mouth

and taught them,

saying:

(λέγων)

Lk vi. 12a, 20

In these days

he went out

into the hills

(ἐξελθεῖν αὐτὸν  
εἰς τὸ ὄρος)

to pray: ...

And he lifted up his eyes  
on his disciples,

(εἰς τοὺς μαθητάς)

and said:

(εἶπεν)

The Greek expressions in brackets indicate the exact parallels between at least two of the three synoptics and together, we conjecture, reflect the original introduction to the 'Sermon'. We now discuss the parallel arrangement line by line. The first three (in Greek four) words in Mt v. 1 provide a link to the editorial summary iv. 23-25, and therefore are editorial. The same is true of Luke's first three (in Greek six) words: this vague date is no more than an editorial link to the previous context.

The following two lines are exact parallels in Mk and Mt - except the tense of the verb (ἀναβαίνει). The different verb in Lk vi. 12a, we may assume, is one of the many stylistic changes which are characteristic of Luke. He perhaps wanted to stress the distance of Jesus' withdrawal rather than his going up on the mountain. Now we are confronted with the question: What was Jesus' intention in 'going up'? Mark's answer is, as we have seen already: the 'Call of the Twelve'. Our assumption that this is an editorial feature is confirmed by the difficulty of imagining what actually happened according to Mark: Jesus first went up on the



mountain and then called to him 'those whom he desired', i.e. the disciples. Verse 14 actually makes a new start: 'And he appointed twelve, (a) to be with him, and (b) to be sent out to preach ...'. Mark's words here reflect the intimate relationship between Jesus and his disciples, and thus deserve our full attention. However, this obviously is no new point here but rather the practice ever since the call of the first disciples, cf. Mk i. 16f. par. What is new, namely the sending out, does not happen in this context, as iii. 19b shows, '... then he went home;'.<sup>1</sup>

Luke's first indication concerning Jesus' intention in 'going up', viz. 'to pray', is obviously secondary.<sup>1</sup> Then he takes over the motif of the 'Call' from Mark and smooths the style (cf. vi. 13: '... he called his disciples, and chose from them twelve, ...'). Lk vi. 17a shows that the appointment of the Twelve Apostles occurred on the Mountain. Why, then, does Luke report a 'Sermon on the Plain' (cf. τόπος πεδινός, 'level place', vi. 17b)? The following facts are revealing for Luke's way of compiling and editing: (A) Luke switches two pericopae of Mark in order to get a threefold circle of hearers of the Sermon; (B) he finds that the great crowd created by his literary activity has no room right on top of 'the mountain' and, consequently, he moves the whole scene to the next suitable place, namely 'a level place' at the foot or on the slope of the mountain.<sup>2</sup>

Hence it follows almost certainly that the original introduction contained in the common catechetical source introduced a *Sermon on the Mount*. The question whether or not Jesus stood on the very top of the mountain or rather on its slope most probably could not be answered from the source - as the expression, 'he went up on the mountain', suggests - and in fact is irrelevant. This is not to say, however, that εἰς τὸ ὄρος may be translated by a more general expression as 'into the hills', or, 'hillside'.

---

1 Cf. K. L. SCHMIDT, *Rahmen*, p. 112: 'The representation of Jesus as preparing himself for the important act of the Call of the Apostles by continuing all night in prayer is strongly psychologizing.'

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 112, and WILFRED L. KNOX, *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*, Vol. II, St. Luke & St. Matthew, Cambridge 1957, p. 7, n.1: '... the "level place" of Luke vi. 17 is hardly explicable except as a correction of the mountain of Matt. v. 1.' We shall return in the following section to KNOX's explanation contained in the rest of this note.

K. L. SCHMIDT is right in saying, 'Jesus stands high on a mountain in loneliness, surrounded only by the disciples.'<sup>1</sup>

The disciples are mentioned explicitly in all three synoptic parallels, although the term itself does not occur in Mark iii.13. The fact that Jesus is mentioned first and the coming of the disciples only in the second place perhaps is meant to stress the point that the initiative was wholly on the side of Jesus. What his actual intention was will be considered in the next section. We may note here already that the expression 'and taught them' (ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς) occurs in Matthew only and therefore most probably is editorial. By adding this special term to the more general verb 'to say' (λέγειν), the final redaction of Matthew announces its own interpretation of the following discourse: a teacher of the law is speaking.<sup>2</sup> As such, of course, 'he sat down' (καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ), 'as did Jewish teachers'.<sup>3</sup> The expression 'and he opened his mouth' befits the solemn occasion described by Matthew, and is almost certainly editorial as well. Finally, Luke carefully avoids saying that Jesus addresses his disciples exclusively, because he presupposes other hearers. As the source almost certainly did not mention the crowds, however, he was compelled to a most ingenious construction, namely: 'And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said: ...'.

We may be quite certain, then, that the common catechetical source contained the following introduction to the Sermon on the Mount:

He went up on the mountain,

(ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος)

and his disciples came to him.

(καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ)

And he said, (καὶ ἔλεγεν)<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> K. L. SCHMIDT, Rahmen, p.109

<sup>2</sup> Cf. G. BORNKAMM, Matthew, p.38, n.1.

<sup>3</sup> W. D. DAVIES, Setting, p.423

<sup>4</sup> We are aware of the fact that more than thirty years ago B. S. EASTON arrived at a very similar conclusion, see his Christ in the Gospels, New York-London 1930, p.19/20: 'To use an argument (sc. in favour of Mark's use of the sayings-source) of a different kind, investigators have given insufficient attention to the fact that Luke and Matthew, despite their differences in structure, both insert the Sermon on the Mount immediately after their parallels to Mark 3:7-13. Why so remarkable a coincidence? And why is Mark 3:13 so hopelessly obscure? The easiest answer is that the Sayings contained a description of the crowds, the ascent into the "mountain", and the Sermon; all our Synoptists used the passage, while the roughness in Mark is due to his omission of the Sermon.'



We now proceed to test our hypothesis that the Sermon on the Mount, which is reported in different versions in Matthew and Luke, is derived from one and the same source, and that its original structure can be detected by way of a comparison between Mt v-vii - which we hold to reflect the original more faithfully - and Lk vi.20-49. As this comparison is provisional only and the details of the texts can be compared in every Synopsis, we give but the beginning of the verses or paragraphs.

#### The Sermon on the Mount

according to M a t t h e w :

v.3 Blessed are the poor in spirit

v.4 Blessed are those who mourn

v.5 Blessed are the meek

v.6 Blessed are those who hunger

v.7 Blessed are the merciful

v.8 Blessed are the pure in heart

v.9 Blessed are the peacemakers

v.10 Blessed are those who are  
persecuted

v.11 Blessed are you when men  
revile you

v.12 Rejoice and be glad

v.13 You are the salt of the earth

v.14 You are the light of the world

v.17 Think not that I have come

v.21 You have heard (on murder)

v.27 You have heard (on adultery)

v.31 It was also said (on divorce)

v.38 You have heard (on swearing)

according to Luke :

vi.20 Blessed are you poor

(vi.21b Blessed are you that weep now)<sup>1</sup>

vi.21a Blessed are you that hunger now

vi.22 Blessed are you when men  
hate you

vi.23 Rejoice in that day

vi.24 But woe to you that are rich

vi.25 Woe to you that are full now

Woe to you that laugh now

vi.26 Woe to you, when all men speak  
well of you

---

<sup>1</sup> Brackets indicate Lucan parallels which are out of order within his version of the Sermon on the Mount.



(Matthew)

v.39b But if any one strikes you

v.42 Give to him who begs from you

v.43 You have heard (love neighbor)

v.44 But I say to you,  
Love your enemiesv.46 For if you love those who  
love youv.48 You, therefore, must be perfect  
as your heavenly Father  
is perfect

vi.1 Beware of practising

vi.2 Thus, when you give alms

vi.5 And when you pray

vi.9 Pray then like this

vi.16 And when you fast

vi.19 Do not lay up ... treasures

vi.22 The eye is the lamp of the body

vi.24 No one can serve two masters

vi.25 Therefore I tell you,  
do not be anxiousvii.1 Judge not, that you be not  
judged

vii.3 Why do you see the speck

vii.5 You hypocrite, first take  
the log

vii.6 Do not give the dogs

vii.7 Ask, and it will be given

vii.12 So whatever you wish that men  
would do to you

vii.13 Enter by the narrow gate

vii.15 Beware of false prophets

vii.18 A sound tree cannot bear  
evil fruit

(Luke)

(vi.29 To him who strikes you)

(vi.30 Give to every one who begs  
from you)v.27 But I say to you that hear,  
Love your enemiesvi.32 If you love those who  
love youvi.36 Be merciful,  
even as your Father  
is mercifulvi.37 Judge not, and you will not be  
judged

vi.41 Why do you see the speck

vi.42b You hypocrite, first take  
the log(vi.31 And as you wish that men  
would do to you)vi.43 For no good tree bears  
bad fruit

(Matthew)

vii.21 Not every one who says to me,  
'Lord, Lord'vii.24 Everyone then who hears  
these words of mine  
and does them ...vii.27 ... and great was the fall  
of it.

(Luke)

vi.46 Why do you call me  
'Lord, Lord'vi.47 Every one who comes to me and  
hears my words  
and does them ...vi.49 ... and the ruin of that house  
was great.

Admittedly, this is not a mathematical comparison, but, because the parallels are stressed, the result is made quite clear; from the beginning to the end of the Sermon on the Mount as reported by Matthew and by Luke, there are so many parallels that there can be little doubt that the two versions are derived from the same source. Often when there are gaps on the side of Luke, this is due to Luke's editorial activities. He follows the outline of Mark closely and inserts sayings from the Sermon into that outline, or he omits sayings which he holds to be unintelligible for his non-Jewish readers. We get the impression, then, that there can be no question of the Sermon on the Mount being 'a free composition of the evangelist', namely, the final editor of Matthew.<sup>1</sup> Even Luke, who - if our view is correct - treated the original Sermon in his source rather freely, retained its basic structure to a certain extent.

What then, is the basic structure of the Sermon on the Mount? It will be useful to separate first the editorial materials from that which stems from the catechetical tradition. We note that there is only one gap on Matthew's side, and that opposite to Luke's four Woes, vi.24-26. These four Woes correspond to Luke's four Beatitudes which - at first glance - seem to be a selection from Matthew's Beatitudes. If our reconstruction of the original introduction to the Sermon, which suggests that the disciples were its hearers is correct, we must conclude that the Woes are editorial. They obviously cannot be addressed to the same group to which the Beatitudes were addressed, namely, to the disciples.

A Matthean section which has no parallel on Luke's side is Mt v.17-20. R.BULTMANN holds that the passage 17-19 'derives from the debate with the Hellenistic Church', and therefore is 'a community product'.<sup>2</sup> More recent redaction-critical research came to the

<sup>1</sup> Cf G.GLOEGE, op.cit., p.208

<sup>2</sup> R.BULTMANN, Tradition, p.146

conclusion that this passage, although vs. 18 seems to have a parallel in Lk. vi. 17, on the whole is an editorial composition.<sup>1</sup> G. BARTH points out, 'By taking over v. 18f., as well as by his own construction of v. 17, Matthew has made his own the concern of the conservative congregation in its struggle for the law.'<sup>2</sup> Mt v. 20 has no parallel in the synoptic tradition and most probably is a redactional introduction to the Antitheses.<sup>3</sup> Hence we may assume that the passage Mt v. 17-20 was no part of the original Sermon.

It is well known that the whole chapter Mt vi is missing in Luke's report of the Sermon. However, some sayings have parallels elsewhere in Luke. It is difficult to find a structure in this chapter and we may assume, therefore, that the final redaction of Matthew expanded the original Sermon here with other materials either from the common source or from the oral tradition. For reasons of both form and content, the three parallel strophes vi. 2-4, 5-6 and 16-18 perhaps belonged to the original Sermon but were omitted by Luke because they reflect a typical Jewish piety. There is no doubt, that vi. 1 is an editorial introduction to this traditional section.<sup>4</sup>

As to the Lord's Prayer and its context, i.e. Mt vi. 7-15, it is quite clear that it does not belong here, because it separates the third strophe mentioned above from the second. We have to do here with a rather mechanical addition, no doubt by the final redaction, for which the key-word 'prayer' was the reason. Although there is little doubt that the Lord's Prayer stems from the catechetical tradition, it probably was no part of the original Sermon.

Another section which perhaps may not have been included originally is the long discourse 'On Anxiety', Mt vi. 25-34//Lk xii. 22-31. For the rest of chapter vi, namely the sayings 'On Treasures' (19-21), 'The Sound Eye' (22-23), and 'On Serving Two Masters' (24),

---

1. See, e.g., G. STRECKER, op. cit. pp 143ff.

2. G. BARTH, in: G. BORNKAMM, Matthew, p. 71; for the whole passage Mt v. 17ff. cf. *ibid.*, pp. 64ff.

3. So G. STRECKER, *ibid.*, p. 151/52; and R. BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 150.

4. Cf. G. STRECKER, *ibid.*, p. 152; and R. BULTMANN, *ibid.*, p. 150.



it is impossible to decide the question for purely 'formal' reasons.

In Matthew's chapter vii, only the saying vs. 6 is completely without parallel in Luke. We assume that its tone was not to Luke's liking and that he therefore omitted it. The two sayings Mt vii. 7-11 and 13-14 probably belong to those which in the common source were part of the Sermon but scattered by Luke. Mt vii. 15-27 on the whole is confirmed to be the original end of the Sermon by the Lucan parallels, except vii. 15, 20 and perhaps 22-23.

After this brief and provisional discussion the following materials emerge from Matthew's report as probable parts of the Sermon on the Mount contained in the common catechetical source: Mt v. 3-12, 13-16, 21-48; vi. 2-6, 16-18, 19-21, 22-23, 24; vii. 1-5, 6, 7-11, 12, 13-14, 16-19, 21, 24-27. At this stage, it is too early to ask, What is the authentic structure of the Sermon on the Mount? For this question can be answered only in connection with another one, namely; What is the meaning, or the theme of the Sermon? 'This question', G. GLOEGE says, 'has raised its head in every century, or rather every vigilant century has found itself faced with this question.'<sup>1</sup> It would bode ill for an age that no longer understood this question.<sup>1</sup> Do we understand it today? Or, has the very expression 'Sermon on the Mount' for us become like a worn coin on which the picture is no more recognizable? Perhaps it is time, then, to switch the two nouns and ask the old question in a new way: What is the significance of the Mount of the Sermon?

The provisional findings in this section, namely, that the 'mountain' in Mt v. 1 par. is no editorial device and Matthew's and Luke's report not 'merely a collection of unrelated sayings of diverse origins, a patchwork'<sup>2</sup>, but on the contrary, that the Sermon on the Mount existed as a fixed group of dominical sayings in a catechetical source which most probably was known to all synoptists, suggest that this new question can fruitfully be discussed even in relation to Jesus himself.

---

<sup>1</sup> G. GLOEGE, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

<sup>2</sup> W. D. DAVIES, *Setting*, p. 1

### 3 The significance of the Mount of the Sermon

When we consider the significance of the Mount of the Sermon, we are reminded of the well known fact that the significance which we attach to anything depends on the presupposition(s) with which we view it. This is not to say, however, that we must approach the subject of our investigation without presupposition(s), but on the contrary that we ought to examine our presupposition(s) critically and state it (them) explicitly.

The designation 'Sermon on the Mount' for Mt v-vii perhaps was first by AUGUSTINE, and that in his special treatise 'De Sermone Domini in Monte'.<sup>1</sup> J.J. JEPSON says, 'He wrote his work during the years 393 to 396 when he served as a priest at Hippo.'<sup>2</sup> There seems to be no direct evidence that this designation, which by now is universally accepted, was used in English before the sixteenth century.<sup>3</sup>

AUGUSTINE's view is this: 'If the question is raised, what is meant by the "mountain", we can well see that it stands for the greater precepts of righteousness, the lesser ones of course being those which were given to the Jews. But here it is one and the same God who through His holy Prophets and servants, by a disposition of time that was perfectly ordered, gave the lesser precepts to a people who as yet had to be controlled by fear, and through His Son the greater ones to a people for whom it was now expedient to be free in love. In the giving of the lesser to the less and the greater to the greater, the giving is by Him who alone

---

1 We shall quote from the ET by JOHN J. JEPSON, St. Augustine, The Lord's Sermon on the Mount, Westminster, Maryland 1956 (Ancient Christian Writers, The Works of the Fathers in Translation, ed. by JOHANNES QUASTEN and JOSEPH C. PLUMPE, No. 5).

2 *ibid.*, p.3 (Introduction).

3 Cf. HARVEY K. McARTHUR, Understanding the Sermon on the Mount, London 1961, p.11; the ref. is to the 'Coverdale Bible of 1535 and the Roman Catholic edition of the New Testament in 1582'.

knows to give to the human race the remedy suitable to the times. Nor is it surprising that the greater precepts are given on account of the kingdom of heaven and the lesser were given on account of an earthly kingdom by that one same God who made heaven and earth. Therefore, concerning this righteousness which is greater, we have the statement by the Prophet: "Thy justice is as the mountains of God"; and this illustrates well that one teacher only, one who alone is competent to teach doctrines so weighty, teaches on a mountain.<sup>1</sup> - 'Thus', J.J.JEPSON explains, 'the mountain which the Lord ascended is to him a symbol of the exalted position from which the Lord gave the greater legislation of the New Law as contrasted with the minor precepts of the Old Law promulgated on Mount Sinai.'<sup>2</sup>

As far as we can see, AUGUSTINE's view, namely that the Mount of the Sermon is meant to recall Mount Sinai and the promulgation of the Old Law has held the field ever since.<sup>3</sup> More recently, redaction criticism has thrown new light on the presuppositions of that view. We refer here especially to the book by REINHART HUMMEL, 'The Discussion between Church and Judaism in the Gospel of Matthew.'<sup>4</sup>

---

1 AUGUSTINE, op.cit., Book One, I,2, p.12/13.

2 ibid., p.5 (Introduction).

3 See however G.STRECKER, op.cit., p.147, n.2: '... - The motif of the mountain (v.1) is not meant to recall the mountain of the promulgation of the Law, for it returns in xv.29 (healing on the mountain), and thus does not go back to Moses-typology but more generally to the style of revelation.' This judgment is based on the assumption that the 'motif of the mountain' in Matthew is editorial (cf. ibid., p.98). Our finding in the previous section was that this is not correct for v.1, because the 'mountain' also appears in the Lucan context of the great Sermon, and is referred to also in Mark. Cf. our following discussion.

4 R. HUMMEL, Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium, (Diss. Kiel 1960), München 1963.



This author starts the first part of his study by stating the problem of 'The Church of Matthew and contemporary Judaism.' 'The question about the historical place of Matthew' he says, 'includes three problems. Of what kind is the Judaism with which he has to do? What is the nature of the congregation which he represents and for whom he writes? What is the relationship between the two?'<sup>1</sup> HUMMEL observes that while the Gospel of Matthew is speaking about the 'Auseinandersetzung', i.e. discussion, conflict, between Jesus and Judaism, it probably inserts 'the picture of Judaism, which stood before his eyes, into the history of the conflict between Jesus and his Jewish opponents'.<sup>2</sup>

HUMMEL follows this line of approach and finds, 'that for Matthew the Pharisees are the actual opponents of Jesus. Herein his own situation obviously is reflected: the pre-dominance of Pharisaism after the destruction of the Temple. Judaism with which he has to do, is partially of another coinage than that with which Jesus had to cope. Matthew inserted this new situation as much as possible, but still respected old tradition, into the history of Jesus.'<sup>3</sup> This method of the final redaction leads however to anachronism. The formula 'the chief priests and the Pharisees' (Mt xxvii.62), for example, 'places the contemporary Jewish authorities and the rulers of the past Temple side by side.'<sup>4</sup> Another anachronism is found in xxiii.2, 'The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat', for this statement is true of the Pharisees only after 70 A.D.<sup>5</sup> It implies, moreover, that the authority of the Pharisaic scribes as a matter of principle is acknowledged and therefore that they must be obeyed, as vs. 3 shows. 'Such an attitude would hardly be understandable after the birkhat ha-minim was in force, which sealed the breach between Church and Judaism.'<sup>6</sup>

---

1 *ibid.*, p.11.

2 *ibid.*, p.12.

3 *ibid.*, p.14.

4 *ibid.*, p.16.

5 *ibid.*, p.31.

6 *ibid.*, p.32.

Furthermore, HUMMEL finds that 'Therefore the Gospel of Matthew cannot be written very much later than about in the year 85 A.D.'<sup>1</sup> and holds that the final redactor of Matthew probably was 'a converted Jewish scribe from the sect of the Pharisees'.<sup>2</sup> Thus we get the following picture of the Church of Matthew: 'She is of a strongly Jewish-Christian coinage, although she includes also gentile-Christians, as is evident from the discussion about the admission of the gentiles and the communion with them. She is ruled by Christian scribes, who have the power in matters of teaching and discipline. She has her own church-discipline. Thus she shows features which correspond to the Judaism of the Synagogue. It may not be overlooked, however, that the Gospel of Matthew attempts to recoin the Jewish forms in a Christian way. ... She does not take part in the services of the Synagogue. ... She is in a stage of consolidation of a markedly original life, without however, severing the links with the Jewish formation.'<sup>3</sup>

The 'presupposition' of the redaction of Matthew is evident from the following statement: 'The destruction of the Temple not only gave to Pharisaism the uncontested power over the people but raised the significance of the Law for Judaism too. As long as the Temple stood, it held together the different sects which fought each other, as the religious centre of the Jewish people. After 70 A.D. the Law alone was left over to give to Judaism her unity.'<sup>4</sup> This is to say, after 70 A.D. not only Judaism but to a great extent the Church of Matthew as well was t o r a h - c e n t r i c, although the 'Messiah', of course, played an important role.

Consequently, the redactor's view concerning the significance of the Mount of the Sermon is this: 'The mountain as a place of teaching relates Jesus with Mount Sinai and with the revelation of the torah which occurred there. Jesus is the second Moses. ... For Pharisaism the written tradition ultimately is identical with the torah revealed at Mount Sinai. As Matthew, as a matter of principle, acknowledges its authority too, one must

---

1 R. HUMMEL, op.cit., p.32.

2 ibid., p.159.

3 ibid., p.32.

4 ibid., p.34.



assume that the alternative mentioned above (sc. the Antitheses are directed either against the rabbinic tradition, or, against the Old Testament law) did not exist for him. Thus the Antitheses are directed against the torah in the form taught by the rabbies.<sup>1</sup>

And from this it follows that 'The Sermon on the Mount is for Matthew the laying of the foundation of the Church, which occurred through the Messianic interpretation of the torah by the new Moses, over against Pharisaic Judaism. This is in accordance with the interpretation of the saying xvi.18f. given above: Peter is the rock, on which the Messiah builds his congregation, because as the one who has power in matters of teaching he guarantees the validity of the new tradition of the law, the origin of which lies in the Antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount.'<sup>2</sup>

Thus for all the difference between the Church of Matthew and Pharisaic Judaism after 70 A.D., both actually stand on a common ground. 'The Sinai-tradition is the common point of departure of the Jewish and the Christian tradition of the law.'<sup>3</sup>

On the whole, we find HUMMEL's form-critical approach to the final redaction of Matthew convincing. We have to be careful, however, with the designation of Jesus as the 'second Moses'. As we have seen above, G.STRECKER categorically denies that the 'mountain' in Mt v.1 relates Jesus with Moses.<sup>4</sup> In this connection, another statement by the same author is important: 'The assumption that in Matthew's representation Jesus teaches a "nova lex" in contrast to the Old Testament is disproved by the positive relationship between the two. On the other hand, the negation shows that we have not to do with a mere "repetition" either.'<sup>5</sup>

1 R.HUMMEL, op.cit., p.72.

2 ibid., p.74/75; to this thesis see now also W.D.DAVIES, Setting. This author understands Matthew as presenting a Messianic Torah in the Sermon on the Mount.

3 R.HUMMEL, ibid., p.75.

4 See above p. 48.

5 G.STRECKER, op.cit., p.147; the word 'negation' in the last sentence refers to the instances where Jesus' teaching seems to abolish the OT law. On the same p. STRECKER argues against G.BORNKAMM's position that in Matthew's Christology Jesus takes the place of a 'Moses novus'.





GÜNTHER BORNKAMM's view concerning the redactional understanding of the mount of the Sermon is similar to that of R. HUMMEL. 'It has often been rightly observed', BORNKAMM says, 'that Jesus appears in Matthew as a second Moses, that the typology of Moses dominates the pre-historical stories, that the mountain of the Sermon on the Mount may possibly be intended as an analogy to Sinai, and that the whole history and teaching of Jesus are presented under the motive of the fulfilling of the law (5,17), "of all righteousness" (3,15).'<sup>1</sup>

The question, 'Is Christ the giver of a nova lex?' is also discussed by BORNKAMM's pupil, GERHARD BARTH.<sup>2</sup> BARTH distinguishes two possible interpretations of the concept of the 'nova lex', namely: 'It can, in the first place, mean that the activity of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount is made parallel or antithetical to the giving of the law through Moses on Sinai. ... In the second place it can mean that the Gospel itself is understood as a law, in a legal way.'<sup>3</sup> Concerning the first possibility, G. BARTH's final conclusion is practically the same as that of G. STRECKER quoted above: 'What is justified in talk about a 'nova lex' consists in the fact that Matthew does not share the understanding of the law in the Rabbinate but rather opposes the Rabbinate face to face. But it would still not be correct to speak of a 'nova lex' because the identity with the law of Sinai is so strongly emphasised.'<sup>4</sup> About the second possibility, G. BARTH says, 'Nor can one speak of a nova lex in Matthew in the second sense, that the Christian message has become a law.'<sup>5</sup>, namely, law in the Jewish sense of 'the way of salvation.'<sup>6</sup>

---

1 G. BORNKAMM, Matthew, p. 35; cf. *ibid.*, n. 2: '... It should be noted that in Matthew's Gospel there is no concept of a nova lex (Bacon, Kilpatrick, etc.) and could not be. Matt. 12,6 says: "A greater than the temple is here", not: than the law; the law is summoned as a witness by Matthew precisely to 12,6 (12,3-7); it validates the Son of man as Lord also of the Sabbath (12,8). ...'.

2 See G. BARTH, Matthew's Understanding of the Law, in: G. BORNKAMM, Matthew, pp. 153-59.

3 *ibid.*, p. 153.

4 *ibid.*, p. 159.

5 *ibid.*, p. 159; cf. also the last sentence of the paragraph: 'But one may perhaps say that the emphasising of works, of judgment according to works and the kind of attack on the Pharisees in Matt. 23 did further the development of the ancient Church in the direction of the nova lex, and this is closely connected with the fact that Matthew was the most quoted of all the Gospels in the ancient Church.'

6 *ibid.*, p. 154.

What we find about the significance of the Mount of the Sermon in W. D. DAVIES' recent book is more or less in line with the view the redaction critics BORNKAMM, BARTH and HUMMEL ascribe to Matthew: 'The case would seem to be that, while the category of a New Moses and a New Sinai is present in v-vii, as elsewhere in Matthew, the strictly Mosaic traits in the figure of the Matthean Christ, both there and in other parts of the Gospel, have been taken up into a deeper and higher context. He is not Moses come as Messiah, if we may so put it, so much as Messiah, Son of Man, Emmanuel, who has absorbed the Mosaic function. The Sermon on the Mount is therefore ambiguous: suggestive of the Law of a New Moses, it is also the authoritative word of the Lord, the Messiah: it is the Messianic Torah.'<sup>1</sup> In fact, for the greater part of his 'examination of the historical setting' of the Sermon on the Mount,<sup>2</sup> DAVIES is engaged in redaction criticism.<sup>3</sup>

To sum up: It would be difficult to deny that - given the prominence of the 'Law' in his time - from the point of view of the final redaction of Matthew the Mount of the Sermon is meant to recall M o u n t S i n a i . The fact that a similar 'motif of the mountain' occurs also in Mt xv. 29 cannot disprove this. On the contrary, the latter instance may be an afterthought to Mt v. 1: The New Moses is greater than the old in that he not only imparts torah on the mountain but there also heals the sick. On the other hand, W. D. DAVIES is right in saying that 'there is no explicit reference to Mount Sinai', and that Mt v-vii is 'ambiguous'.<sup>4</sup> As to the problem of the New Law, the best answer is that we have to do in the Church of Matthew with a "progressive" understanding of the law. This is to say, the emphasis is on continuity between the torah imparted by Moses and its new interpretation by the Messiah Jesus.

---

1 W. D. DAVIES, Setting, p. 93.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 436.

3 See *ibid.*, p. 415: 'As we have seen in the preceding pages, Matthew drew around the figure of Jesus the mantle of a lawgiver.' The tendency of the final redaction is, according to DAVIES, 'rabbinizing Jesus' (*ibid.*)

4 *ibid.*, p. 93.



In the sixth chapter of his comprehensive book, W. D. DAVIES joins in the new quest of the historical Jesus.<sup>1</sup> His point of departure is the question, 'Can we define the relation in which the Christ of the Mount stands to Jesus himself?'<sup>2</sup> The assumption behind this question is that 'the Christ of the Mount' is merely a redactional motif. Our finding in the previous section was that this most probably is not so. Therefore, we must put our question differently, namely: What is the significance of the Mount of the Sermon for Jesus himself?

According to our hypothesis, i.e. that the materials of the Sermon on the Mount stem from a common catechetical source, we must look for an answer to this question in the anterior context of the Sermon in the same source, including, of course, the reconstructed introduction. A Synopsis suggests that the common source began with an account about John the Baptist, cf. Mt. iii. 1ff., Mk i. 1ff., Lk iii. 1ff. We assume that the evangelists worked over the original account, and that Mark omitted part of it as not immediately relevant for his purpose, as, e.g., Mt iii. 7-10 // Lk iii. 7-9.

In this connection, we may recall an interesting observation made by J. A. T. ROBINSON. 'Now it does not require Sherlock Holmes', he says about Mk i. 2f., 'to detect that there is something very peculiar here. The words "Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way" are not written in "Isaiah the prophet": they are written in Malachi (iii. 1; cf. Exod. xxiii. 20 (LXX)). ... It is all a very botched affair, and I have little doubt that someone wrote in the words from Malachi to supply the clue which he knew was coming later, that the messenger of Malachi (alias Elijah) was none other than the Baptist himself.'<sup>3</sup> ROBINSON may be right that the Malachi quotation came from Mt xi. 10 // Lk vii. 27, as it agrees neither with the LXX nor with the MT.<sup>4</sup> In this case, we may take this to be another indication of Mark's knowledge of the common source and identify that 'someone' with Mark himself.

---

1 W. D. DAVIES, Setting, p. 415: VI. The Setting in the Ministry of Jesus.

2 *ibid.*, p. 415.

3 J. A. T. ROBINSON, Elijah, John and Jesus: An Essay in Detection, in: NTS, Vol. IV, 1957-58, p. 267.

4 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 267, n.1.



The first exact parallel in the account about John the Baptist is a quotation from Is x 1.3, cf. Mt. iii. 3 // Mk i. 3 // Lk iii. 4. In Matthew, this quotation is preceded by a summary of John's message, which according to Mt iv. 17 is the same as Jesus' own when he began to preach in Galilee. Whose view is this? It may well be historical that for some time after Jesus' baptism by John 'the message of Jesus was still dominated by the preaching of the Baptist'.<sup>1</sup> It is obvious in all synoptics that the quotation is meant to explain the message of John, and we try to find out its original meaning by way of the following comparison, using Mark's formula of citation which - with a small addition - is attested also in Luke and therefore may be more original:

As it is written in Isaiah the prophet,

'The voice of one crying in the wilderness:

Prepare the way of the Lord,

make his paths straight.'

Is x 1.3:

A voice cries:

"In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord,

make straight in the desert a highway for our God."

It is quite clear that the synoptics report Is x 1.3 in a Christological interpretation, which was imposed on the original saying by changing the expression 'our God' ( τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ) into 'his' ( αὐτοῦ ).<sup>2</sup> Hence the 'way' becomes 'the way of Jesus' instead of 'the way of the Lord', i.e. of 'our God', and John, in turn, becomes the forerunner of Jesus. It is reasonable to think that this interpretation is not editorial but already contained in the common source.

But was it also John's own interpretation? Let us consider the possibility that he applied Is x 1.3 to himself in its original form and meaning. The 'way of the Lord' is

1 J. A. T. ROBINSON, art. cit., p. 273; cf. also the following sentence: 'Subsequently, after a period of independent but parallel missions, their paths divided: John goes to prison and Jesus to Galilee.' Admittedly, ROBINSON's reference here is to the fourth Gospel and his line of thought is different.

2 So W. MICHAELIS, art. *δύος*, in: *TWNT V*, p. 95; cf. *ibid.*, 'From this we may conclude that the preceding κύριος too refers not (as in Is) to God but to Jesus; John the Baptist was given the task to prepare the way for Jesus as his forerunner, i.e. to announce his coming.'

a common figure in Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>1</sup> The latter takes up a prophecy by I Isaiah, i.e. Is xxxv. 1-10, and uses the expression in the sense of 'the Holy Way', i.e. a processional road, on which the exiles headed by Yahweh return to Zion in a mighty procession. Is there any evidence that John expected God Himself to come? This may be implied in Mt iii. 7 par: '... Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come?'

On the other hand, according to Mt iii. 11 John expected also 'the mighty one' 'who is coming after me', i.e. an eschatological figure which - according to J. A. T. ROBINSON - had 'largely been painted from Malachi's palette.'<sup>2</sup> We quote here the relevant passage Mal iii. 1-5a:

"Behold, I send my messenger to prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to his temple; the messenger of the covenant in whom you delight, behold, he is coming, says the Lord of hosts. But who can endure the day of his coming, and who can stand when he appears?

For he is like a refiner's fire and like fuller's soap; he will sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and he will purify the sons of Levi and refine them like gold and silver, till they present right offerings to the Lord. Then the offering of Judah and Jerusalem will be pleasing to the Lord as in the days of old and as in former years. Then I will draw near to you for judgment; ...'

'Was Jesus this figure? is John's question', namely, in Mt xi. 3.<sup>3</sup> J. A. T. ROBINSON holds - rightly, we believe - that during an early Judaen ministry 'Jesus was willing to accept the role that John had cast for him'<sup>4</sup> but later laid it aside: 'Jesus has come as the proclaimer of deliverance rather than judgment, of the acceptable year, rather than the terrible day, of the Lord.'<sup>5</sup>

---

1 See Is xlii. 16; xliii. 16, 19; xlvi. 17; xlix. 11 and li. 10.

2 J. A. T. ROBINSON, art. cit., p. 270.

3 *ibid.*, p. 270.

4 *ibid.*, p. 271.

5 *ibid.*, p. 273.



Consequently, Jesus passed the role of the eschatological figure from Malachi, alias Elijah, to John the Baptist, i.e. to the very same John who during his own ministry had announced the impending coming of that figure: '... and if you are willing to accept it, he is Elijah who was to come. He who has ears to hear, let him hear' (Mt xi. 14-15).<sup>1</sup> Yet the essential function of John and Jesus remained the same, namely, '... to make ready for the Lord a people prepared' (Lk i. 17d).<sup>2</sup>

Nevertheless, it is reasonable to think that the arrest of John and his own withdrawal into Galilee prompted Jesus to reformulate his message. This is actually what Mt iv. 17 says: 'From that time Jesus began to preach, saying, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." ' Mt iv. 23 reveals the new emphasis of Jesus' over against John's message: Jesus went about Galilee 'preaching the gospel of the kingdom' (κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας). Although the summary Mt iv. 23-25 is an editorial composition, this expression, we believe, points the way to the right interpretation of Mt iv. 17 par.

Before we follow that way, we must realise two things: (1) Mt iv. 17 par. contains no more than the central theme of Jesus' message; (2) the actual preaching of Jesus is contained to a certain extent in the parables of the kingdom. The first point is self-evident. As to the second point, we may quote here the final conclusions of C. H. DODD's well-known book, without, however, accepting DODD's position as a whole: '... we have warrant for affirming that God comes to meet us in history, and sets before us the open but narrow door into His Kingdom. To accept His Kingdom and to enter in brings blessedness, because the best conceivable thing is that we should be in obedience to the will of God. Such blessedness may be enjoyed here and now, but it is never exhausted in any experience that falls within the bounds of time and space. Our destiny lies in the eternal order, and eye hath not seen,

---

1 This is the main-thesis of J. A. T. ROBINSON's art.; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 263ff., and esp. p.276.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 276; ROBINSON holds - again, rightly, we believe - that the Benedictus Lk i. 68-79 was addressed originally not to John the Baptist but to Jesus. His final evidence is in i. 69, 'and has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David', i.e. in a house or 'lineage John did not belong; but Jesus did.' (*ibid.*, p. 281)



nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things the Lord hath prepared for them that love Him.<sup>1</sup>

The following quotations suggest the background against which the gospel of Jesus may be understood:

O sing to the Lord a new song;

sing to the Lord, all the earth:

Sing to the Lord, bless his name;

tell of his salvation from day to day.

(LXX = εὐαγγελίσετε ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ)  
Declare his glory among the nations,

his marvelous works among all the peoples: ...

Say among the nations, "The Lord reigns:"

(LXX = ... ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν)

Yea, the world is established,

it shall never be moved;

he will judge the peoples with equity." (Ps xcvi. 1-3, 10)

Get you up to a high mountain,

O Zion, herald of good tidings;

(LXX = ὁ εὐαγγελιζόμενος Σιών )

lift up your voice with strength,

O Jerusalem, herald of good tidings,

(LXX = ὁ εὐαγγελιζόμενος Ἱερουσαλήμ )

lift it up, fear not;

say to the cities of Judah,

"Behold your God:"

Behold the Lord God comes with might,

and his arm rules for him;

behold, his reward is with him,

and his recompense before him. (Is xl. 9-10)

1 C. H. DODD, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, (6th ed.) London 1941, p. 209/10; cf. also J. JEREMIAS, *The Parables of Jesus*, London 1954, esp. pp. 89ff., III. The Message of the Parables of Jesus; and E. JÜNGEL, *Paulus und Jesus*, Eine Untersuchung zur Präzisierung der Frage nach dem Ursprung der Christologie, Tübingen 1962, esp. pp. 87-215; II. Jesus und die Gottesherrschaft. JÜNGEL attempts to clarify the fundamentals of Jesus' message of the kingdom from the following parables: Mt xiii. 44-46; Mt xiii. 47f. and xiii. 24-30; Mk iv. 26-29; Mk iv. 30-32 par. Mt xiii. 31f. par Lk xiii. 18f.; Lk xi. 5-8; Lk xvi. 1-7; Lk xv. 11-32; Mt xx. 1-15; Lk x. 30-35. See our following discussion.

How beautiful upon the mountains

are the feet of him who brings good tidings,

(LXX = ὡς πόδες εὐαγγελισμένου ἀκοῇ εἰρήνης)

who publishes peace, who brings good tidings of good,

(LXX = ... ὡς εὐαγγελισόμενος ἀγαθὰ)

who publishes salvation,

who says to Zion, "Your God reigns."

(LXX = ... βασιλεύσει σου ὁ θεός)

Hark, your watchmen lift up their voice,

together they sing for joy;

for eye to eye they see

the return of the Lord to Zion. (Is lli. 7-8)

The Hebrew equivalents of the New Testament Greek terms εὐαγγέλιον and εὐαγγελίζεσθαι are the Old Testament terms b<sup>e</sup> sorah and bisser. J. W. BOWMAN recently has found the 'missing link' between the two, and that in 'the Christian Palestinian Syriac, which preserved the traditional Galilean Aramaic at this point'.<sup>1</sup> 'It would have been natural for Jesus,' BOWMAN concludes, 'for example, to employ bsr and bsora for the distinctive NT gospel message and its proclamation, because it was these words which he had been accustomed to use in his native Aramaic in quoting or paraphrasing from Deutero-Isaiah or the Psalms such passages as referred to the eschatological hope of his people and because he believed that hope now to be fulfilled in his own ministry.'<sup>2</sup>

Hence we may assume that the essence of the gospel of the historical Jesus was this: The return of the heavenly King to Zion is at hand. And it has become quite clear that the juxtaposition of Mt iii. 2 and 3, i.e. Is x 1.3, is justified, because both verses refer to the same expectation.

It is worth noting at this point that Jesus stood between two other groups of people in Palestine which shared a similar hope. On the one hand there were the Zealots: '... the antithesis (sc. 'between the dark political reality and the bright prophetic ideal)', JOSEPH KLAUSNER says, 'provoked the healthy and courageous younger generation - especially those of simple Galilee, far removed from the more sophisticated society of Jerusalem -

1 J. W. BOWMAN, The Term 'Gospel' and its Cognates in the Palestinian Syriac, in: NT Essays, p. 61.

2 *ibid.*, p. 61/62.



to fight for their nation, their country and their God: the ardour of the Zealots recognized no sovereignty of flesh and blood: God alone was King in Israel; and (as is invariably the case with extreme enthusiasts) they found it necessary to add to their zeal a tyranny and violence which only served to augment the prevailing confusion.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand there were the 'quietist' circles. J. KLAUSNER explains, "To the attitude of the "quietist Pharisees" conformed "those that feared the Lord", "the meek upon earth", such as belonged to no party and who whole-heartedly loathed force, and were unable to fight against the high-handed empire: the earth was given into the hands of sinful men - therefore these lifted up their eyes to heaven, waiting for the kingdom of heaven, for the coming of the Messiah, for the time when God alone should be king of all the earth and righteousness prevail throughout the world, when ungodliness should be consumed like smoke and that proud kingdom should pass away and the people of Israel be exalted above all the Gentiles."<sup>2</sup>

We believe that Jesus stood between these two extremes in the sense that he was neither ready to fight nor to wait but to act in accordance with his divine call:

He went up (ἀνέβη) on the mountain,

and his disciples came to him,

and he said,

"Blessed are the poor in spirit,

for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. ... " (Mt v. 3)

Two points are important in this reconstructed introduction and first saying of the Sermon on the Mount: First, if the keynote of the whole Sermon is struck in Mt v. 3 // Lk vi. 20 - and it is reasonable to assume this - , we may conclude that its central theme is the same as that of Jesus' kerygma, or, gospel (εὐαγγέλιον), namely: 'the kingdom of heaven'. Thus we are not misled by the insistence of the final redaction of Matthew on Jesus' preaching the

---

1 J. KLAUSNER, Jesus of Nazareth, His Life, Times, and Teaching, London 1925, p. 171.

2 *ibid.*, p. 172; KLAUSNER holds that 'It was from these circles of the "meek" that Jesus and his new teaching sprang.' (*ibid.*, p. 173)



'gospel' and teaching the Sermon on the Mount, i.e. 'Law'. In fact, the proclaimed gospel and the so-called 'Sermon' are different in form only: In Mt v. 1ff. we have to do with an 'enacted' and - to use the expression coined by G. SCHILLE - with a 'learnt gospel'. In other words, in the Sermon on the Mount Jesus entrusted to his disciples a résumé of his gospel, which he proclaimed otherwise by way of parables. This is explicitly stated in the following saying from the common source, Mk iv. 11 par.:

To you has been given the secret of the kingdom of God,  
but for those outside everything is in parables.

In our opinion, Mark's form of this saying is authentic, except the singular 'the secret' (τὸ μυστήριον), which - in accordance with Mark's intention in writing his Gospel - refers to the identity of Jesus. 'The secrets' in Mt xiii. 11 clearly refer to the 'teaching',<sup>1</sup> or, the 'learnt gospel' of Jesus. We may add here that this interpretation can be tested by way of a comparison between the fundamentals of Jesus' message of the kingdom derived from the parables and the essence of the Sermon on the Mount: the two must be more or less identical.

Second, 'to go up', or, 'to ascend' (ἀναβαίνειν, <sup>c</sup>alah) is a technical term denoting the cultic procession to the Temple of Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup> It is well known that a group of psalms is marked by a derivative of the root <sup>c</sup>lh as 'Songs of Ascents', or, 'Pilgrim Songs'.<sup>3</sup> The tenor of these songs is evident from the beginning of Ps cxlii:

I was glad when they said to me,  
"Let us go to the house of the Lord!"  
Our feet have been standing  
within your gates, O Jerusalem: ..." (1-2)

The verb 'ascend' is used in the technical sense in Ps xlvii. 5 - a psalm which 'in later

---

1 So also G. BORNKAMM, Matthew, p. 19, n. 2; BORNKAMM says in the text, 'Thus there is here the same contrast between discipleship and Israel which is characteristic of the whole of Matthew's Gospel.'

2 See J. SCHNEIDER, art. ἀναβαίνειν, in: TWNT I, pp. 516ff.

3 The derivative is shir hamm<sup>c</sup> loth, see Pss cxx-cxxxiv. According to A. WEISER, The Psalms, A Commentary (ET), London 1962, p. 100, however, Ps cxlii only is a 'genuine pilgrim song'.

Judaism ... was regarded as a special psalm for the New Year festival'.<sup>1</sup> A. R. JOHNSON has drawn attention to the 'word-play on the appellation "Most High" ('el<sup>e</sup> yon) in the triumphant assertion that Yahweh has ascended ('alah) to His Temple with appropriate acclamation and to the sound of the horn'.<sup>2</sup> We quote here the verses 1-7 to show the word-play and the context of the technical term:

Clap your hands, all peoples:  
 Shout to God with loud songs of joy:  
 For the Lord, the Most High ('el<sup>e</sup> yon), is terrible,  
 a great king over all the earth.  
 He subdued peoples under us,  
 and nations under our feet.  
 He chose our heritage for us,  
 the pride of Jacob whom he loves.

Selah

God has gone up ('alah) with a shout,  
 the Lord with the sound of a trumpet.  
 Sing praises to God, sing praises:  
 Sing praises to our King, sing praises:  
 For God is the king of all the earth;  
 sing praises with a psalm.

In the time of Jesus, the joy of the pilgrims perhaps was not quite as abundant as that of Ps xlvii. The lot of the peoples were reversed: Rome had subdued Israel under her feet. And what was worse, the Temple of Herod was deficient for all its architectural splendour: 'Confessedly, the real elements of Temple-glory no longer existed. The Holy of Holies was quite empty, the ark of the covenant, with the cherubim, the tables of the law, the book of the covenant, Aaron's rod that budded, and the pot of manna, were no longer in the sanctuary. The fire that had descended from heaven upon the altar was extinct. What was far more

---

1 A. WEISER, *Psalms*, p. 374.

2 A. R. JOHNSON, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*, Cardiff 1955, p. 66; cf. also *ibid.*, n. 2.: 'For this use of the verb 'alah with reference to the ascent of Mount Zion, see Ps. xxiv. 3 ... and Ps. lxxviii. 19 ... and, for the subsequent word-play on 'el<sup>e</sup> yon, it should be borne in mind that, just as the Ark is the symbol of Yahweh's Person, so Mount Zion corresponds to the divine Mount of Assembly, and the Temple itself is the earthly counterpart of the divine King's heavenly Palace.'



solemn, the visible presence of God in the Shechinah was wanting. Nor could the will of God be now ascertained through the Urim and Thummim, nor even the high-priest be anointed with the holy oil, its very composition being unknown.<sup>1</sup>

By now the original significance of the Mount of the Sermon has become clear, and we may venture to formulate our hypothesis which - we believe - fits well into the historical situation: In the view of Jesus himself the Mount of the Sermon was meant to recall Mount Zion, and his 'going up' together with his disciples marked the beginning of the 'Way of the Lord', i.e. of God's eschatological return to Zion and His subsequent Enthronement as King of all nations.

As we are speaking about the historical Jesus in our hypothesis and of a 'beginning',<sup>2</sup> we must take a step further and ask the following question, although it is held to be secondary or even irrelevant by most scholars:<sup>3</sup> Can we put our finger on some geographical spot on the map of Palestine and say with conviction, This is the Mount of the Sermon?

Matthew as well as Luke agree on one point, namely: When Jesus had finished the Sermon, 'he entered Capernaum' (cf. Mt viii. 5; Lk vii. 1). Especially the first Gospel clearly suggests that at the time of the Sermon this town was Jesus' dwelling-place (cf. iv. 13), but the same is evident from Lk iv. 31ff. (cf. Mk i. 21ff.) too. According to the 'Israel Guide', 'Capernaum is a Greek corruption of the Hebrew name: Kefar-Nahum - Village of Nahum. We do not know the identity of Nahum for whom the village was named; according to a mediaeval Jewish tradition the name was meant for Nahum the prophet of the end of biblical times, whose burial place was shown there.'<sup>4</sup> There seems to be little doubt as to the historicity of this town.

---

1 ALFRED EDERSHEIM, The Temple, Its Ministry and Services as they were at the Time of Jesus Christ, (new impr.) London 1959, p. 61/62.

2 We realise that in our hypothesis this 'beginning' is supposed to be both eschatological and temporal. We cannot enter into this problem here but try to clarify it in a more appropriate context, viz. in chapter VI. 1.

3 See, e.g., K. L. SCHMIDT, Rahmen, p. 70, and G. STRECKER, op-cit., p. 98: 'This implies that the "mountain" is understood as a place of revelation; there is primarily no question of a geographical conception but of a topic for the description of an eschatological event.'

4 ZEV VILNAY, Israeli Guide, (4th ed.) Jerusalem 1960, p. 447/48.



'The town', J. KLAUSNER says, 'was stretched along the western shore of the lake near where the Jordan enters, and is most probably represented today by "Tel-Hum" (corrupted from Tel-Nahum or Tanhum), a ruin near Hirbet Chorazi (the Chorazin mentioned side by side with Kefarnaum both in the Gospels and Talmud); in both sites are remains of ancient synagogues remarkable for massive stonework and fine carvings and ornamentation.'<sup>1</sup>

If we may take for granted that Jesus' dwelling-place at the time was Capernaum, the identification of 'the mountain' is easy: There seems to be only one mountain in the vicinity to this town.<sup>2</sup> To quote again the 'Israel Guide': 'Tabgha = Mt. of the Beatitudes, 4 kms (2 ½ mls), ascent of 100 m. The highway proceeds north along the ascent of the Mount of Beatitudes (Blessedness), carrying on its top a big convent and a round church. From the highway proceeding to Rosh-Pinna and Tsefat, a road branches off to the right towards the summit of the Mount of the Beatitudes which overlooks the Sea of Galilee. The convent and the church belong to the Italian Franciscan nuns. On this site, according to Christian tradition, Jesus preached the famous "Sermon on the Mount", Mt 5, 1-35.'<sup>3</sup> The question as to whether or not this is the historical truth, of course, cannot be decided any more. However, no one would wish to deny that the geographical 'ascent' mentioned here indeed is eminently suitable for an 'eschatological-theological ascent' suggested in our hypothesis.

As to the 'Way of the Lord' and its understanding suggested in our hypothesis, we may recall the well-known fact that the 'Way' was one of the earliest names for Christianity. In fact, men and women 'belonging to the Way' ( τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας , Acts ix. 2) would be an apt definition of the disciples after the 'Sermon', and that in the sense that the disciples from that time participated in the 'Way of the Lord'. On the other hand, the fact that the 'Way' can be 'known' (cf. Acts xxiv. 22: εἰδὼς τὰ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ ), links up with the notion of a 'learnt gospel'. However, JAMES S. STEWART is right in saying,

---

1 J. KLAUSNER, Jesus, p. 261.

2 So also JOSEF STAUDINGER S. J., Die Bergpredigt, Wien 1957, p. 10.

3 Z. VILNAY, Israel Guide, p. 453/54.

'the important point is that it (sc. "The Way") referred primarily to a way of living, not a way of thinking. ... The first century mission Churches in Asia and Europe made headway precisely because they confronted the world with a way of life, and not with a speculative system.'<sup>1</sup>

This brings us to the last question of this section, namely: If the Sermon on the Mount marks the beginning of the 'Way of the Lord', i.e. the preparation of His people for the return to Zion, what is supposed to happen when the procession arrives at its destination? The answer to this question is contained in the passage Is ii. 2-4 (cf. Mic iv. 1-4), which belongs to the same Zion-tradition as, e.g., Is xl.3:

It shall come to pass in the latter days  
 that the mountain of the house of the Lord  
 shall be established as the highest of the mountains,  
 and shall be raised above the hills;  
 and all the nations shall flow to it,  
 and many people shall come, and say,  
 "Come, let us go up (na<sup>c</sup> a leh) to the mountain of the Lord,  
 (LXX = Δεῦτε καὶ ἀναβῶμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου)  
 to the house of the God of Jacob;  
 that he may teach us (yorenu) his ways (mid<sup>e</sup> rakhaw),  
 (LXX = καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ )  
 and that we may walk (n<sup>e</sup> l<sup>e</sup> khah) in his paths."  
 For out of Zion shall go forth the teaching (torah),  
 (LXX = ἐκ γὰρ Σιων ἐξελεύσεται νόμος )  
 and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.  
 He shall judge between the nations,  
 and shall decide for many peoples;  
 and they shall beat their swords into plowshares,  
 and their spears into pruning hooks;  
 nation shall not lift up sword against nation,  
 neither shall they learn war any more.

---

1 J. S. STEWART, A Man in Christ, The Vital Elements of St. Paul's Religion, (9th impr.) London 1957, p. 6.



'The Old Testament view of history', ROBERT MARTIN-ACHARD says, referring to Is ii. 2-4, 'is that its fulfilment is centripetal, not centrifugal; for Yahweh has made an appointment to meet with mankind not at the end of the earth but in His sanctuary at Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> ... As G. von Rad has observed, the background of Is. ii. 2-4 is cultic. At the back of Isaiah's mind are the annual festivals that bring the pilgrims flocking together to Jerusalem and some of their culminating moments - the Yahweh theophany, the rehearsal of His demands, and the manifestation of His judgments. But the prophet imports the Jerusalemite liturgy into his eschatology and extends its scope to make it world-wide. Tomorrow it will be the heathen who will form a kind of gigantic procession going up to the City of Yahweh, where the God of Israel will grant them audience, show them His glory, and settle their disputes.'<sup>2</sup>

Jesus' going up on the mountain mentioned in Mt v. 1, as we have seen, points to a similar background as that of Is ii. 2-4, and Mt viii. 11-12 (cf. Lk xiii. 28-30), which Matthew reports right after the Sermon on the Mount, suggests that Jesus shared Isaiah's hope concerning the 'many people' as well:

"I tell you, many will come from east and west  
and sit at table with Abraham, Isaac,  
and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven,  
while the sons of the kingdom  
will be thrown into the outer darkness;  
there men will weep and gnash their teeth."

As our last key-word, i.e. 'cultic', appeared in the quotation by R. MARTIN-ACHARD, and the article by G. VON RAD referred to in it links Is ii. 2-4 with a part of the Sermon on the Mount,<sup>3</sup> we now may conclude the present chapter which serves the framing of our hypothesis.

To sum up, we state the findings of this chapter in two points - leaving out the middle stage of transmission - , the second being hypothetical:

- (1) In the view of the final redaction of Matthew, whose outlook to a great extent is *tora h - centric*, the Mount of the Sermon is meant to recall Mount Sinai. On the redactional plain the character of the Sermon is catechetical, and that in the sense of 'learn't gospel'.

---

1 R. MARTIN-ACHARD, *A Light to the Nations*, A Study of the Old Testament Conception of Israel's Mission to the World (ET), Edinburgh and London 1962, p. 61.

2 *ibid.*, p. 65.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 65, n.1; we shall discuss this article later. The reference is to Mt v. 14.



- (2) In the view of the historical Jesus, whose outlook to a great extent is hiero-centric (cf. *ἱερόν*), the Mount of the Sermon is meant to recal Mount Zion. The character of the authentic Sermon is cultic. Hence it follows that its original form and meaning can be determined by means of a cultic interpretation.

# THE PRESUPPOSITION OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

In the previous chapter we tried to determine the character of the Sermon on the Mount, both on the redactional plain and on the plain of the historical Jesus. Our hypothesis relating to the 'authentic' Sermon is that its character is cultic and therefore that it calls for a cultic interpretation. The method of cultic interpretation is not new. At the turn of this century, HERMANN GUNKEL discovered the cultic origin of the oldest Hebrew psalmody and laid the foundation for a cultic interpretation of the psalms.<sup>1</sup> Yet despite its history of more than fifty years, the results of this interpretation have never managed to command universal acceptance, and are still disputed among the members of different 'schools'. Moreover, even the existence of homogeneous 'schools' has been called in question. 'In truth', H. H. ROWLEY says, 'it is as misleading to speak of the "Scandinavian School" as to speak of the "Myth and Ritual School", since there are very real divergencies amongst the members of that supposed school.'<sup>2</sup>

Fortunately, however, we now are able to base the proposed cultic interpretation of the authentic Sermon on the Mount on two volumes recently published in English, which are written by a scholar who must be given the most significant place in the history of cultic

---

1 See H. GUNKEL, Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit, Göttingen 1895; Die Orientalischen Literaturen, (Kultur der Gegenwart, ed. P. HINNEBERG, 1, 7), Berlin-Leipzig 1906; Die Königspsalmen, in: Preuss. Jahrbücher, 158, 1914, pp. 42ff.; art. 'Psalmen', in: RGG (1st and 2nd ed.); Ausgewählte Psalmen, (4th ed.) Göttingen 1917; and Die Psalmen, Göttingen 1926.

2 H. H. ROWLEY, Ritual and the Hebrew Prophets, in: Myth, Ritual, and Kingship, ed. S. H. HOOKE (2nd ed.), Oxford 1958, p. 236/37.

interpretation, namely SIGMUND MOWINCKEL.<sup>1</sup> He says in his own preface, 'The great majority of the psalms which have come down to us do not simply derive, as a matter of form history or literary history, from ancient cult poetry - they are real cult psalms composed for and used in the actual services in the Temple.' It is, of course, out of the question that the Sermon on the Mount in its authentic form is 'cult poetry' or even that it should stand in such an immediate relationship to the temple cult as the cult psalms proper. The following observation by S. MOWINCKEL, however, indicates the nature of the relationship which we believe to exist between the temple cult and the Sermon: 'One result of my work in connexion with the psalms - which has even surprised myself - is to see to how great an extent the piety and image of God which grew up within the official cult religion in the Temple at Jerusalem is presupposed by, and not a result of, the activity of the great classical prophets.'<sup>2</sup> This is to say, in the same way as the temple cult was the presupposition of the activity of the great classical prophets, it was the presupposition of the activity of Jesus.

This, then, is what the title of this present chapter implies and, at the same time, a concise formulation of our hypothesis concerning the Sermon: The temple cult is the presupposition of the activity of the historical Jesus, as it is evident from the Sermon on the Mount.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, Vol. I and II (ET), Oxford 1962; in fact this ed. is more than a translation of *Offersang og Sangoffer*, Oslo 1951, in that "it has been revised in certain respects" (Author's Preface).

2 *ibid.*, Author's Preface.

3 It will be noted that our term 'presupposition' to some extent corresponds to the well known form critical expression 'Sitz im Leben', i.e. 'place in life'. For non-initiates, the latter term can be misleading: 'The Sitz im Leben', R. BULTMANN explains, 'is not ... an individual historical event, but a typical situation or occupation in the life of a community.' (*Tradition*, p. 4) - Over against this, J. JEREMIAS, *Parables*, p. 88, speaks of a two-fold 'Sitz im Leben', viz.: 'First, the original historical setting, not only of the parables, but of all the sayings of Jesus, is their individual, concrete situation in the activity of Jesus. Then there is a second historical setting which is the situation of the primitive Church'. W. D. DAVIES, *Setting*, even distinguishes three basic 'settings' (cf. pp. 191, 415). In order to avoid misunderstanding, we speak of the 'presupposition' of the Sermon rather than of its 'Sitz im Leben', when the reference is to the individual historical event in the activity of Jesus.



This hypothesis takes two things for granted, namely: (1) Jesus' repeated experience of the temple cult at Jerusalem;<sup>1</sup> (2) his exact knowledge of the cult psalms and of the 'cultic poetry' of the prophets.<sup>2</sup>

'What is meant by cult?' - S. MOWINCKEL answers, 'Cult or ritual may be defined as the socially established and regulated holy acts and words in which the encounter and communion of the Deity with the congregation is established, developed, and brought to its ultimate goal. In other words: a relation in which a religion becomes a vitalizing function as a communion of God and congregation, and of the members of the congregations amongst themselves.'<sup>3</sup>

For our purpose we may use the terms 'cultic' in the sense of 'reflecting' 'the socially established and regulated holy acts and words'. It is in this sense that - according to our hypothesis - the Sermon on the Mount is 'cultic', or even 'cultic poetry'.<sup>4</sup> Hence the cultic interpretation of the Sermon means setting its 'forms' in relation to the cultic acts they reflect,<sup>5</sup> and above all: tracing the cultic origin of some of its main-concepts, in order to understand their original meaning. For all the difference, this kind of interpretation remains basically the same as MOWINCKEL's 'cult-functional method': 'All scientific research demands a proper arrangement of material, a classifying and grouping,

1 Cf. A. EDERSHEIM, Temple, p. 5 (Preface): 'The Temple and its services form, so to speak, part of the life and work of Jesus Christ; part also of His teaching, and of that of His apostles.'

2 Cf. J. KLAUSNER, Jesus, p. 234: 'Jesus certainly knew the Law and the Prophets and the Book of Psalms, and had, also, some knowledge of the Book of Daniel and also, perhaps, of the Book of Enoch.'

3 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 15.

4 S. MOWINCKEL expresses the same thing by 'non-cultic imitations of the style of the cultic psalms', namely, by Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah. (cf. *ibid.*, p. 14). - As to the definition of the Sermon as 'cultic poetry', the poetical form of much of its materials has been recognised long ago. See esp.: DAVID HEINRICH MÜLLER, Die Bergpredigt im Lichte der Strophentheorie, Wien 1908; C. F. BURNEY, The Poetry of our Lord, An Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ, Oxford 1925; and MATTHEW BLACK, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, (2nd ed.) Oxford 1954.

5 Cf. S. MOWINCKEL, *ibid.*, p. 23: 'It follows from what has been said in Chap. I that a cultic interpretation - and a real understanding - of the psalms means setting each one of them in relation to the definite cultic act - or cultic acts - to which it belonged.'

so that the things which belong together may be seen in their mutual connexions and illuminate one another. But the principles and criteria of classification must be derived from the material itself, not from disparate fields or modern interests and points of view. ... All this modern grouping only leads us to ask the poets about things which interest us, but to which they often have no answer; instead of trying to see things from their point of view, and asking what is in their mind ...<sup>1</sup>.

It goes without saying that the last sentence of MOWINCKEL's statement is extremely relevant for the cultic understanding of the Sermon on the Mount in the context of the new quest of the historical Jesus: We have to see things from his point of view, and ask what was in his mind when he 'went up' on the mountain and put his message in the form he did.

The present study is, of course, not the first attempt to use the method and findings of the cultic interpretation of the psalms for the understanding of the ministry and teaching of Jesus. Before we proceed with the approach outlined above, then, we may pause to look at and mention similar attempts. First to be considered is, of course, S. MOWINCKEL's own book 'He That Cometh', in which he examines the development of the Messianic hope from its origin, namely, the Israelite conception of kingship, to its transformation by Jesus and its application to himself.<sup>2</sup> This development is put forward with such a weight of learning that it seems utterly impossible to cover the same ground again within the limits of the present study, and that with the expectation of new insights into the ministry and teaching of Jesus.

As we cannot do justice to MOWINCKEL's comprehensive volume in a brief review, we come directly to the decisive difference between his approach and our working hypothesis mentioned above: S. MOWINCKEL's book is intended to lead up to the message of Jesus as it is contained in the present form of the New Testament,<sup>3</sup> or, concerning the Gospels, to the redactional plan, whilst our working hypothesis is supposed to lead up to the historical Jesus, and that through his teaching on the Mount. In other words, the difference lies in the understanding of the New and, of course, not of the Old Testament. It is from the point of view

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 23.

2 S. MOWINCKEL, He That Cometh (ET), Oxford 1956.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 499/50.



suggested in our working hypothesis that we pay respectful attention to MOWINCKEL's final conclusion about Jesus' own conception of his Messiahship, namely: 'The essential and decisive way in which Jesus transformed the idea of the Messiah was that he combined the thought of the suffering, dying, and exalted Servant of the Lord with that of the Son of Man, who will come again on the clouds of heaven. The Son of Man will be rejected, will suffer many things, will die, be buried, and rise again on the third day.'<sup>1</sup> Yet we suspect this to be the central idea and, above all, the formulation of the early Church rather than of Jesus himself. We touch here on the complex problems of Christology, a subject on which profound differences of opinion exist, even among New Testament scholars.

On the other hand, we believe that the cultic interpretation of the psalms by S. MOWINCKEL enables us to clarify the pre-supposition of the Sermon on the Mount. From his own 'cultic approach' to Jesus in 'He That Cometh' we have to keep in mind especially the following six points: (1) The title *hammashi<sup>a</sup>h* denotes 'Yahweh's Anointed', i.e. the reigning king of Israel, and does not occur as a technical term ('Messiah') in the Old Testament;<sup>2</sup> (2) the content of the Messianic conception originated in the royal ideology,<sup>3</sup> more especially in the Enthronement Festival;<sup>4</sup> (3) from the time of Deutero-Isaiah onwards, 'the thought of the kingly rule of Yahweh, the kingdom of God, was the central religious idea in the Jewish future hope';<sup>5</sup> (4) the temple cult was the service of Yahweh alone, in which the Messiah was mentioned only as a subject of prayer;<sup>6</sup> (5) only in apocalyptic circles, the ideas of which were not fully representative of Judaism, was the concept of the Messiah central;<sup>7</sup> and finally (6) 'The kingdom will be established by a miraculous divine intervention:

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, He That Cometh, p. 449.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 4.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 122.

4 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 143.

5 *ibid.*, p. 144; (our spacing).

6 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 341.

7 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 342.



it will be God's own work, not the work of man.<sup>1</sup>

Another attempt which applies the findings of Scandinavian scholarship to the Messianic conception of the early Church is AAGE BENTZEN's 'King and Messiah'.<sup>2</sup> A main difference between MOWINCKEL and BENTZEN is the latter's definition of the Servant figure in Deutero-Isaiah as 'Moses redivivus', which explicitly is rejected as 'wrong' by MOWINCKEL.<sup>3</sup> BENTZEN finds 'three forms' of the conception of the Messiah 'with common roots (sc. in the idea of "First Man") - three aspects of a totality which in different ages have been accentuated in different ways. - First we described the Royal Messiah of the Ancient Nations and of pre-exilic Israel, as he is presented in the Royal Psalms. He is the fighter in the ritual combat of the Creation Drama, the Bearer of Salvation, present in full actuality in the "reliving" of the saving facts in the New Year Festival. He has suffered the vicissitudes of the combat, but is now able to proclaim the victory of God. Secondly, we considered the Moses redivivus, described as the Prophet of the Exile who, in the shape of the Innocent Sufferer, secures the Salvation of the people. And finally, we considered the Heavenly Son of Man, as the impersonation of the Kingdom of God in the Book of Daniel.'<sup>4</sup>

In the last chapter of his book A. BENTZEN furthermore draws attention to the following historical tendencies: 'In the period of the Israelite Monarchy, we encounter, in the anti-Canaanite reaction, a tendency towards "demythologizing". The death of the Divine King is not accepted as an "article of faith" in Israel, but expressions originating in this circle of ideas have been retained in cultic poetry. Even the idea of the divinity of kings was taken over, but it was adapted to Israelite conceptions. The notion of Divine Sonship by adoption, known from Mesopotamia, was probably the form in which divine

1 S. MOWINCKEL, He That Cometh, p. 171; the ref. is to Is ix. 1-6.

2 A. BENTZEN, King and Messiah (ET) London 1955.

3 See *ibid.*, pp. 65ff. (cf. the title of the German original: Messias - Moses Redivivus - Menschensohn, Zürich 1948); and S. MOWINCKEL, He That Cometh, pp. 228/29.

4 A. BENTZEN, *ibid.*, p. 77; it is obvious that we have to do in these conclusions with features of the 'Christ of the Church' (cf. *ibid.*, p. 76) rather than with features of the historical Jesus.

kingship could be tolerated. Later, in Deutero-Isaiah, every trace of it vanished. - However, in later Judaism and in the early Church we observe a "renaissance of mythology". The ancient conceptions of the Divine King were used as material in Christian circles for the development of a Christology as early as the New Testament. Here the role played by the "aspect of suffering" from Isaiah 53, which is combined with the figure of the Son of Man, is of first importance. The result is that Jesus re-unites all aspects of the idea of Primeval Man and Primeval King in His own person, and so the entire mythology of the Ancient East is re-  
 i/ enstated.<sup>1</sup> It is the purpose of the examination of the findings of the cultic interpretation of the psalms in this present chapter and of our following discussion to throw some new light on the interesting question whether or not and - if the answer is in the affirmative - to what extent Jesus himself participated in the observed 'renaissance of mythology'.<sup>2</sup>

Instead of discussing the pros and cons of a cultic interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount and other attempts which might display similar features,<sup>3</sup> we now proceed to examine the cult psalms as interpreted - mainly - by S. MOWINCKEL, using three concepts derived

---

1 A. BENTZEN, op. cit., p. 78/79.

2 Mention must be made here of R. BULTMANN's controversial attempt at 'Demythologizing' the New Testament, which was inaugurated by his lecture 'Neues Testament und Mythologie' held in 1941 (see now Kerygma and Myth (ET), London 1953, pp. 102-23, by the same author). However, it is not our intention to engage into that discussion.

3 See, e.g., HELMER RINGGREN, The Messiah in the Old Testament, London 1956. The point of departure of this author is the cultic interpretation of the psalms (cf. p. 8), but later he strongly emphasizes the servant aspect (p. 67). On H. RIESENFELD, Jésus transfiguré, Copenhagen 1957, see S. MOWINCKEL's judgment, 'Connexion with the cult ("rapports avec le culte") is in Riesenfeld's discussion a meaningless phrase. In the Jewish cult the Messiah was neither worshipped nor believed to be present.' (He That Cometh, p. 468).

We may add here the name of HANS WINDISCH who - as far as we can see - was first to recognise a connection between the temple cult and the Sermon on the Mount. See his article Die Sprüche vom Eingehen in das Reich Gottes, in: ZNW, 1928, 27. Band, Heft 2, pp. 163ff., esp. pp. 180ff.; and The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount, A Contribution to the Historical understanding of the Gospels and to the Problem of Their True Exegesis (ET), Philadelphia 1951. Although the 'True Exegesis' is historical rather than cultic in WINDISCH's own view, we shall refer to his understanding of the Sermon in the course of our own discussion.

The two studies by AILEEN GUILDING, The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship, A study of the relation of St. John's Gospel to the ancient Jewish lectionary system, Oxford 1960, and PHILIP CARRINGTON, The Primitive Christian Calendar, A study of the making of the Markan Gospel, Vol. I, Introduction and Text, Cambridge 1952, advocate a liturgical rather than a cultic interpretation.



from the Sermon as principles of classification and as headings of the following three sections. They are the concepts of 'initiation' (cf. Mt vii.13 'Enter ...' and the Beatitudes), the 'kingship of Yahwey' (cf. Mt v.3 '... the kingdom of heaven.') and the 'sonship of the king' (cf. Mt v.9 'sons of God' and v.45 'sons of your Father who is in heaven'). At first glance, the choice of these three concepts looks quite arbitrary. In fact, however, this approach reveals the structure of the temple cult at the time of the ancient 'feast of Yahwey' (hag YHWH), which is the presupposition of both the 'Way of the Lord' in Deutero-Isaiah and the Sermon on the Mount. Moreover, it ultimately reveals - as will be demonstrated below - the structure of the authentic Sermon and the identity and mission of its author.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> We know, of course, that only a minority of Old Testament scholars agree completely with S. MOWINCKEL's thesis concerning this festival which we try to follow in our present chapter. (See, e.g., HANS-JOACHIM KRAUS, Gottesdienst in Israel, Grundriss einer Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Gottesdienstes, (2nd, completely revised ed.) München 1962, p.29/30, 'f) Tendenzen der neueren Kultforschung', where the scholars who agree and those who disagree with MOWINCKEL's thesis are listed.)

However, our proposed cultic interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount is not dependent on every detail of MOWINCKEL's understanding of the cult psalms. In ancient Israel, the cultic structure of the three feasts of pilgrimage (hag) was very similar, and we may assume, furthermore, that even at the time of Jesus the basic structure of the three great feasts was still the same. The shortest and perhaps oldest calendar about the three great feasts of pilgrimage is contained in the Elohist Code of the Covenant, Ex xxiii.14-17: 'Three times in the year you shall keep a feast (tahog) to me. You shall keep the feast of unleavened bread (hag hammaççoth); as I commanded you, you shall eat unleavened bread for seven days at the appointed time in the month of Abib, for in it you came out of Egypt. None shall appear before me empty-handed. You shall keep the feast of harvest (hag haqaçir), of the first fruits of your labor, of what you sow in the field. You shall keep the feast of ingathering (hag ha'asiph) at the end of the year, when you gather in from the field the fruit of your labor. Three times in the year shall all your males appear before the Lord God.'

The third feast of pilgrimage to the Temple, which in later calendars is called 'Feast of Booths' (sukkoth, cf. Dt xvi.13,16; Lev xxiii.34) was the most important feast even in Josephus' time. (For a representation of this feast by a scholar who does not agree with S. MOWINCKEL, see ROLAND DE VAUX, Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions, London 1962 (2nd impr.), pp.495ff.) Our attempt to reconstruct the temple cult as it was at the time of the feast par excellence during the period of the Davidic monarchy, and that according to S. MOWINCKEL, in fact is similar to that by H. -J. KRAUS, op.cit., p.242ff., namely, to recover 'Die Struktur eines Festes'.



## 1 The concept of initiation

After the methodological considerations at the outset of this chapter, we must pick up the thread of our discussion at the end of the previous chapter. Our argument was that Jesus' 'going up' on the Mount of the Sermon marked the beginning of the 'Way of the Lord'.<sup>1</sup>

H. -J. KRAUS suggests the following beginning of the temple cult: 'The festival cult proper began with the solemn procession of the Ark to the temple-mountain. About the place where the cult community assembled for this initial act, we can only express suppositions: Perhaps in the area south of the city of David. The procession began with a *proskynesis* "at his holy mountain" (ps xcix.9). Here the first hymns would be tuned up - songs which culminate in a "summons to enter into the sanctuary":<sup>2</sup>

O come, let us sing to the Lord;  
let us make a joyful noise to the rock of our salvation!  
Let us come into his presence with thanksgiving;  
let us make a joyful noise to him with songs of praise!  
For the Lord is a great God,  
and a great King above all gods.  
In his hand are the depths of the earth;  
the heights of the mountains are his also.  
The sea is his, for he made it;  
for his hands formed the dry land.  
O come, let us worship and bow down,  
let us kneel before the Lord, our Maker! (Ps xcv.1-6)

S. MOWINCKEL holds that the beginning of the festal procession is referred to in Ps lxviii. 7-10, 17, 29:

(7-10) O God, when thou didst go forth (b<sup>e</sup> ʕe<sup>2</sup> th<sup>e</sup> kha) before thy people,  
when thou didst march through the wilderness,

---

<sup>1</sup> See above p. 63.

<sup>2</sup> H. -J. KRAUS, Gottesdienst, p. 245.

the earth quaked, the heavens poured down rain,  
 at the presence of God;  
 yon Sinai quaked at the presence of God  
 the God of Israel.

Rain in abundance, O God, thou didst shed abroad;  
 thou didst restore thy heritage as it languished;  
 thy flock found a dwelling in it;  
 in thy goodness, O God, thou didst provide for the needy. ...

(17) With mighty chariotry, twice ten thousand,  
 thousands upon thousands  
 the Lord came from Sinai into the holy place. ...

(29) Because of thy temple at Jerusalem  
 kings bear gifts to thee.

'Here we are told', MOWINCKEL says,<sup>1</sup> 'how Yahweh personally led his people out of the desert to Canaan, by means of a simple picture, the picture of a triumphal procession. The term "go forth" (*yasa'*) refers to the start of such a festal procession. The description, however, is not just meant to be an account of the events of the past; this "act of salvation" is being "remembered" and thus re-experienced as actual presence; the festal procession of the day is identical with the act of salvation of the past. Even today Yahweh comes, as he did before, from his original dwelling-place in Sinai (v.18) and enters his "abode", the Temple (v. 29), accompanied by his delivered people.'

Although there is little doubt about the 'place in life' of Ps lxxviii indicated in this passage by S. MOWINCKEL,<sup>2</sup> a concrete allusion in the text to the Ark is missing.<sup>3</sup> It is found, however, in Ps cxxxii - which partly overlaps with Ps lxxviii - , of which we quote here the decisive verses, viz. 6-10:

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 173; MOWINCKEL uses the enumeration of the MT, whereas our cit. and enumeration as usual is from the RSV.

2 For a full discussion see S. MOWINCKEL, *Der Achtundsechzigste Psalm*, Oslo 1953.

3 Cf. A. WEISER, *Psalms*, p. 482, n. 2.

Lo, we heard of it in Ephrata,  
 we found it in the fields of Jaar.  
 "Let us go to his dwelling place;  
 let us worship at his footstool : "  
 Arise, O Lord, and go to thy resting place,  
 thou and the ark of thy might.  
 Let thy priests be clothed with righteousness,  
 and let thy saints shout for joy.  
 For thy servant David's sake  
 do not turn away the face of thy anointed one.

Verse 10 suggests a pre-exilic origin of this psalm, because the expression 'thy anointed one' (m<sup>e</sup> shihekha) denotes the earthly king.<sup>1</sup> With S. MOWINCKEL we believe that 'the procession is here looked upon as a repetition of Yahweh's first entry into Jerusalem, when David laid the foundation of the cult of Yahweh there and introduced the holy ark as the centre of the cult and the symbol of the personal presence of Yahweh.'<sup>2</sup>

This is the decisive point of MOWINCKEL's interpretation of the 'enthronement psalms', and we therefore quote his arguments in favour of Ps cxxxii as 'the "text" of a dramatic procession with Yahweh's ark': 'That Yahweh's ark, the hub of the old cultic centre of Shiloh, actually did play a part in the institution by David of the cult of Yahweh in Jerusalem is known to us from the tradition in 2 Sam. 6, but it is also a self-evident deduction: David could not have indicated more clearly that his new kingdom was to be based on the traditions of the old Israel. And considering all we know about the way in which cult institutions and the foundation of a kingdom were celebrated in the ancient orient, we may take it for granted that such a ceremony would be repeated as an annual festival; and then everything indicates that the festival of the institution of Temple and cult in Jerusalem was identical with the new year festival, the enthronement

1 Cf S. MOWINCKEL, He That Cometh, p. 5; A. WEISER, Psalms, p. 779.

2 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 174/75; referring to vs. 7, A. WEISER denies the idea of repetition: 'There is no question here, as many commentators have assumed, of carrying the Ark in procession; according to v.7 it is, after all, already in the Temple; rather it is a question of the appearing of God from Sinai or from heaven, as in Num. 10.35ff.; Judg. 5.4f.; Isa. 6.1ff.; Pss. 18.9ff.; 68.17,24, and especially in I Kings 8.10f.; and therefore of his advent at his resting-place above the wings of the cherubim upon the Ark, which personify the clouds, the chariot of the Godhead, and so also the presence of God.' (Psalms, p. 781)



festival of Yahweh.<sup>1</sup>

The root of the term 'feast' (*hag*) (of Yahweh) used for this festival, which means 'to dance, to turn around',<sup>2</sup> points to its joyful character, of which we get a vivid impression from Ps lxxviii. 25:

Behold, everyone! the procession (*halikhoth*) of Yahweh,  
the holy procession of my God and King;  
singers in front, musicians behind (them),  
between, young girls with tambourines.<sup>3</sup>

The intercession for the king in Ps cxxxii. 10 perhaps was attached to a sacrifice for the success of the undertaking, which was offered up at the outset of the procession.<sup>4</sup> The beginning of its second stage is marked by the temple gate, and it is at this point the cultic concept of initiation which, we believe, is mentioned in Mt vii. 13 and is the background against which the Beatitudes (Mt v. 3-12 // Lk vi. 20b-23) may be understood, comes in.

The tenor of the concept of initiation is evident from Ps cxviii. 26, 27:

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 175. Mention must be made here of two basic disagreements about the character of the 'enthronement festival'. (A) O. EISSFELDT, *Jahwe als König*, in: *ZATW*, 46, 1928, pp. 81ff., 'tries to deny that an act of enthronement is described in the psalms.' MOWINCKEL criticises EISSFELDT's 'isolating method' and maintains that 'only a comprehensive interpretation of all traces, can afford a truly representative total picture, which will throw light on all the details.' (*Psalms II*, p. 223/24)

(B) H. - J. KRAUS, *Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament*, Tübingen 1951, 'finds evidence in 2 Sam. 6 and 1 Kgs. 8 of a yearly repeated festival in Jerusalem, a feature of the feast of tabernacles, in which the great procession with the ark of Yahweh played an essential part, and where the king has a central place as the leader of cult.' 'But he is wrong', MOWINCKEL says, 'in calling this festival "das königliche Zionfest" and maintaining that the king whom Yahweh has chosen is the central figure. In so far as we may draw conclusions from the above texts, the religious focus is decidedly the personal presence of Yahweh as represented by his ark ... . The king plays a prominent part in the cult, but nothing more.' (*Psalms II*, p. 238/39) See also R. DE VAUX, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 504-06, where the author denies the existence of an 'enthronement' festival. As far as we can see, we have to do here with the same 'isolating method' which MOWINCKEL criticised with reference to EISSFELDT.

2 Cf. R. DE VAUX, *ibid.*, p. 470; DE VAUX adds, 'Even today, the Moslems call the pilgrimage to Mecca the *hajj*.' See also S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 10/11.

3 Trans. S. MOWINCKEL, *ibid.*, p. 172.

4 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 176.

Blessed be he who enters (baruk haba') in the name of the Lord! <sup>1</sup>

We bless you from the house of the Lord.

The Lord is God,

and he has given us light.

Bind the festal procession (hagh) with branches,

up to the horns of the altar:

We quote here A. WEISER's comment on vs. 26, which is especially interesting because it opens a window to the New Testament: '(26) Having reached the interior of the sanctuary those who enter therein are greeted by the blessing pronounced by the priests. We have to think of them as the speakers in v. 26 and perhaps also in v. 27. The first part of the blessing, which has also been used in the account of the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem (Matt. 21, 9), is addressed to the king, the second part to the festival congregation.'<sup>2</sup>

Psalms xxiv. 3-10 gives a full picture of this stage of the procession:

"Who shall ascend (alah) to the hill of the Lord?

And who shall stand in his holy place?"

"He who has clean hands and a pure heart,

who does not lift up his soul to what is false,

and does not swear deceitfully.

He will receive blessing from the Lord,

and vindication from the God of his salvation."

"Such is the generation of those who seek him,

who seek the face of the God of Jacob."

Selah.

"Lift up your heads, O gates!

and be lifted up, O ancient doors:

that the King of glory may come in."<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Cf. S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms II*, p. 50; we use in this context the term 'initiation' in the sense of the well known terminus technicus of the study of religion, which as such is much more clear than any other possible rendering, like 'entry', 'admission', 'admittance', 'acceptance'.

2 A. WEISER, *Psalms*, p. 729.

3 If this stanza actually is part of the 'liturgy of the gates', and A. WEISER agrees to this, we are at a loss to understand this author's insistence in interpreting it as a 'theophany in the temple which was dramatized in the cult' (*Psalms*, p. 234). It is quite clear from the following liturgical dialogue that we have to do here with the procession outside the gate, which is accompanied by the presence of Yahweh - presumably symbolized by the ark - and demands admittance in his name.



"Who is the King of glory?"

"The Lord, strong and mighty,  
the Lord, mighty in battle! "

"Lift up your heads, O gates:

be lifted up, O ancient doors!  
that the King of glory may come in."

"Who is the King of glory?"

"The Lord of hosts,

he is the King of glory!"

Selah. <sup>1</sup>

'What is of special interest in this connexion', MOWINCKEL says<sup>2</sup>, 'is the second scene: the question from the leader of the procession and the answer from the "gate-keeper", who, in earlier times at any rate, belonged to the higher clergy: in pre-exilic times the "three keepers of the door" ranked next to the chief priest, and so were second from the top (2 Kgs. 25.18).' The leader of the procession inquires for the conditions of entry, the 'torot d'entré'<sup>3</sup>, 'i.e. authoritative divine "instruction" (tôrâ) through the priest as to what is demanded from those who are admitted to the sanctuary and cult and the blessing thereof.'<sup>4</sup> 'The pattern for this part of the liturgy would then be:

1. Who shall be admitted to the hill of Yahweh?
2. The answer of the priests: he that hath kept such and such rules; he that is of such and such a character.
3. The answer of the procession: we have kept and fulfilled all this.'<sup>5</sup>

---

1 Quotation marks are added to the trans. of the RSV, in order to stress the dialogical character of this psalm; cf. A. WEISER, Psalms, p. 231f.

2 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 177; the second scene mentioned by MOWINCKEL is identical with the first scene cit. above, namely Ps xxiv. 3-6.

3 To this expression see S. MOWINCKEL, Le Décalogue, Paris 1927, where the author proves that the 'torot d'entré' belong to the decalogical tradition. Note, however, this recent correction of his earlier views: 'In Le Décalogue the present author had fancied the "torot d'entré" to be the origin of the promulgation of the commandments at the renewal of the covenant, but in fact we have to deal with two parallel cultic phenomena and developments of the Israelitic ritual.' (Psalms I, p. 180, n. 188).

4 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 178.

5 *ibid.*



Pointing to Ps xv as 'an independent parallel to the part of Ps xxiv which speaks of the conditions of admittance', MOWINCKEL mentions the following interesting observation: 'We notice that ten conditions are mentioned here. ... The traditional figure 10 in such groupings of the fundamental commandments of the covenant ("the decalogues") is probably derived from the instruction of pilgrims: one commandment for each finger.'<sup>1</sup> In this connection, G. VON RAD may remind us of the fact that 'In the Old Testament the Ten Commandments are never spoken of as law: they are called only "the Ten Words" ('srth hdbhrym Ex xxxiv. 28; Deut. iv. 13, x. 4), and right down to the end Israel sang the praise of the revelation of the divine will for justice as a saving blessing of a very high order. It was a guarantee of her election, for in it Jahweh had shown his people a way and a statute.'<sup>2</sup> This links up with the new thesis put forward by S. MOWINCKEL, namely the twofold cultic 'place in life' of the decalogical tradition. 'At which of these two points within the ritual of the festival the decalogical tradition first came in is a less important question. The fundamental commandments of the covenant of Mount Sinai encounter the congregation outside the temple gate, and they are also heard at a climax of the festal cult, at the renewal of the covenant. Two, by themselves independent, cultic ideas and customs: the announcement of the conditions of admittance to the sanctuary, and the renewal of the covenant with its conditions, both receive a new substance of ideas from the historical tradition in the religion of Israel. And this probably happened under mutual influence.'<sup>3</sup> This is extremely important for the understanding of the Sermon on the Mount, because it suggests that - as we shall try to show below - both the Beatitudes and the Antitheses stem from the decalogical tradition.

Another point of interest is that while 'in principle' the commandments are related to Israel collectively, 'in the "liturgy of entry" the commandments are of such a nature that the challenge

---

1 *ibid.* p. 179.

2 G. VON RAD, *Theology I*, p. 195.

3 S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 180; Thus the author assumes the influence of the temple cult on the formulation of the Sinai tradition in Exodus and vice versa. For evidence he points to the possibility that the 'torot d'entré' may have been 'cut into a stone or engraved on tablets at the entrance of the temple', and more especially to the 'limestone tablet set up at the entrance to "the court of Israel" in the Temple of Herod, enforcing the interdict against the access of all non-Jews'. His conclusion is, 'The tradition that the ten commandments were written on such tablets is an echo of such a custom.' (*ibid.* p. 178, and n. 185 on the same p.)

must be taken up by the individual, who is put face to face with his personal responsibility, both for his own "blessing" and for the future of the people.<sup>1</sup> In this connection MOWINCKEL mentions Is xxxiii. 14-16 and Mic vi. 6-8, where this cultic situation is imitated. We quote these two passages as two examples of cultic poetry:

The sinners in Zion are afraid;  
 trembling has seized the godless:  
 "Who among us can dwell with the devouring fire?  
 Who among us can dwell with everlasting burnings?"  
 He who walks righteously and speaks uprightly,  
 who despises the gain of oppressions,  
 who shakes his hands, lest they hold a bribe,  
 who stops his ears from hearing of bloodshed  
 and shuts his eyes from looking upon evil,  
 he will dwell on the heights;  
 his place of defence will be the fortress of rocks;  
 his bread will be given him, his water will be sure.  
 "With what shall I come before the Lord,  
 and bow myself before God on high?  
 Shall I come before him with burnt offerings,  
 with calves a year old?  
 Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams,  
 with ten thousand rivers of oil?  
 Shall I give my first-born for my transgression,  
 the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?"  
 He has showed you, O man, what is good;  
 and what does the Lord require of you  
 but to do justice, and to love kindness,  
 and to walk humbly with your God?

According to S. MOWINCKEL, Ps cxviii probably belongs to the same festival as the Pss xxiv and xv discussed above. 'This psalm, too,' he says, 'starts outside the temple gate

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 180.



and reflects the entry through the "Gate of Righteousness". This is probably the name of an actual gate, very likely the innermost temple gate, through which only "the righteous" - the congregation in a state worthy of the cult<sup>1</sup> - are allowed to enter.<sup>2</sup> The following section of Ps cxviii, viz. 19-29, depicts the actual entry into the temple and, at the same time, presents us with materials which are relevant for the content of the concept of initiation:

Open to me the gates of righteousness,  
 that I may enter through them ( 'abho<sup>2</sup>-bham)  
 and give thanks to the Lord.  
 This is the gate of the Lord;  
 the righteous shall enter through it (yabho<sup>2</sup> u bho).  
 I thank thee that thou hast answered me  
 and hast become my salvation.  
 The stone which the builders rejected  
 has become the head of the corner.  
 This is the Lord's doing;  
 it is marvellous in our eyes.  
 This is the day which the Lord has made;  
 Let us rejoice and be glad in it.  
  
 Save us (hoshiya<sup>c</sup> h na<sup>3</sup>), we beseech thee, O Lord!  
 O Lord, we beseech thee, give us success!<sup>3</sup> ...  
 Thou art my God, and I will give thanks to thee;  
 thou art my God, and I will extol thee.  
 O give thanks to the Lord, for he is good;  
 for his steadfast love endures for ever!

---

1 Cf. the following explanation by MOWINCKEL, which shows a certain development of the idea of 'worthiness' or 'righteousness' belonging to the temple cult: 'Originally, these laws of the sanctuaries were of an essentially ritual cultic and taboo nature, and concerned with external things; at certain sanctuaries for instance no admittance was granted to women. But certain gross crimes and all sorts of ritual impurity were also reasons for exclusion. It is a remnant of such old prohibitions that in Jerusalem the blind and paralysed were not admitted to the Temple. But gradually the moral commandments became more prominent. In this way religious and moral instruction about the fundamental laws of Yahweh would grow to be a permanent element of the cultic ritual.' (Psalms I, p. 177/78)

2 *ibid.* p. 180.

3 Vss. 26 and 27 are quoted above p. 80.



In this text 'righteousness' is mentioned as a condition of entry. What is the meaning of this term? As we shall discuss this further below, we quote here provisionally G. VON RAD's answer: 'But this much becomes clear: those who come to worship were asked for something like a declaration of loyalty to Jahweh's will for justice. These commandments were regarded as perfectly capable of being fulfilled, and indeed as easy to fulfil. Hence "the gates of righteousness" are spoken of, through which only "righteous people" enter.'<sup>1</sup>

There are two other questions which must be raised in this connection. Obviously, the figure of the 'gate' is the cultic symbol of initiation in Israel. Our problem, then, is this: Does the participant of the procession undergo any actual experience when he enters the 'gate'? In other words, is there any difference between an 'initiated' and an 'uninitiated'? MOWINCKEL says, 'The very fact that the congregation was allowed to enter through the Gate of Righteousness was at the same time a corroboration of its righteousness and an imparting of the power of "righteousness and happiness."<sup>2</sup> This imparting of power 'happens' in the 'blessing', which in the text above and in Ps xxiv. 5 stands parallel to 'salvation'.<sup>3</sup>

What, then, is 'blessing' in a cultic context? 'In this form', MOWINCKEL answers, 'the earliest conception of the cultic words still makes itself felt: the idea of the effectual word, "creating what it mentions". Blessing (berākḥâ) is a basic word in the Israelite picture of real life.'<sup>4</sup> Put briefly, blessing is identical with the very powers of life and their manifestations in external and internal happiness and welfare; ... To have "blessing" includes whatever the Israelite

---

1 G. VON RAD, Theology I, p. 378; cf. *ibid.* n. 19: 'Ps cxviii. 19f.; Is. xxvi. 2. The sayings about entering the kingdom of God still speak of a showing of a *δικαιοσύνη*; the form taken by the liturgy in the gate lasted on as long as this; H. WINDISCH, in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1928, esp. pp. 177ff.'

2 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 181; cf. the n. attached to this statement: 'In Babylonia, too the different temple gates had names indicating the blessing received when entering: "the gate of grace", "the gate of salvation", "the gate of life" and so on. The sick person for instance who is to be cleansed and obtain "salvation" enters through the 12 gates of the Marduk temple, and for each gate he gets the blessing expressed by the name: "In the gate of grace he gets grace, in the gate of salvation he sees salvation, in the gate of life, life is given to him." See ZIMMERN in ZDMG 76, 1922, p. 49, and above p. 171.'

3 See above p. 80.

4 To this see also J. PEDERSEN, Israel I-II, pp. 182-212.

understood by the term *šālôm*, "wholeness", "welfare", "harmony", or "peace", as it is usually translated ... It is the mysterious "potency" and power and strength, immanent in life itself; so that the Israelitic *berākḥâ* in many ways corresponds to the power which the phenomenology of religion has called "mana". "Blessing" belongs to the "sacred things"; it is a holy power, living in the lives of clan and individual. The word really indicates a health-giving power, creating and promoting life, the power of blessing, "blessedness". "The blessed one" (*bārûkh*) is a person "having himself blessing".<sup>1</sup> Thus we may conclude, in short, that the congregation which was allowed to enter through the gate, and so the individual initiate, experienced 'a holy power', 'blessedness', 'wholeness' (*shalom*).

The second question concerns the fact that Ps cxviii. 27a mentions 'light' as a divine gift to the initiate. What is the meaning of this in its cultic context? MOWINCKEL says about this question, "It is a procession psalm and alludes to the "day" of the feast (v.24), to the procession up to and around the altar, and to the green branches with which the altar was covered "up to its horns", or, as read in Sukka IV. 5, "so that their tops bent over the altar". The psalm alludes also to the Hosanna-cry of the procession, and to the light of the torches in the torch dance on the first night of the feast, giving the rites a symbolic interpretation: "Yahweh is our God who has brought us light" (27)."<sup>2</sup> This links up with A. WEISER's interpretation of this verse: '(27) The blessing comes "from the house of the Lord", where God is present. With the words "The Lord is God, he has given us light", which are modelled on the Aaronite benediction (Num.6 24ff.) and points to the theophany, the priests, too, now join in the testifying to God, and so include themselves with the one who has been saved and with the testifying congregation, united by their joint declaration of faith."<sup>3</sup> Thus light in this context is a symbol for 'life, happiness and salvation', the ritual lightings probably are 'a reminiscence of an ancient sun and light ceremony',<sup>4</sup> and in the cult of the temple the symbol of light more especially points to the theophany.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms II*, pp. 44/45.

2 S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 120; see also *ibid.* p. 182.

3 A. WEISER, *Psalms*, p. 729.

4 Cf. S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 131; and the same page n.80. For other reminiscences of ancient sun and light ceremonies, which contribute to the meaning of 'light', cf. 2 Sam xxiii.4; Ps lxxxiv.11; Is lx. 1 and Mal iv. 2.

5 For the various conceptions of theophany see A. WEISER, *Psalms*, pp. 38f.



As we shall try to understand Mt v. 14 against this background, we may ask here a further question in view of Mt v. 13, namely: Is there any question of 'salt' belonging to cultic terminology as well? As far as we can see, there is no reference to 'salt' in the cult psalms. There is no doubt, however, that the ultimate origin of the salt in Mt v. 13 is the cult. It is well known that the Sinai-covenant between Yahweh and Israel was - according to the oldest tradition - concluded by a cultic meal of the leaders and elders of Israel (Ex xxiv.9-11; cf. Ps 1.5). 'In a similar way the mere taking of salt causes a perpetual communion (Num xviii. 19; 2 Chr xiii. 5), a fact which according to the later interpretation is meant to recall the salt used for the seasoning of the offerings (Lev ii.13).'<sup>1</sup> In our present context, the reference to the 'covenant of salt' (b<sup>e</sup> rith melah) is of special interest in 2 Chr xiii.5, because this expression is associated to the concept of kingship (mam<sup>e</sup> lakhah):

'Ought you not to know that the Lord God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel for ever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt?'

The point is this: the salt symbolizes the lasting character of God's gift to David and his sons, i.e. the kingship.

A final observation may be added here, which shows that the 'place in life' of the concept of initiation is not only the temple cult in general, but more exactly the New Year festival. 'It is not rare in the time-reckoning of ancient nations', MOWINCKEL says, 'to find that a rather indefinite "New Year's Tide" precedes the later definite "New Year's Day", or that several annual new year festivals were celebrated, whenever one arrived at an important new departure in the round of life and nature. This happened both in Egypt and in Babylonia. The idea is connected with the general conception of the need of special initiating and inaugurating "transition-rites" at all the important new departures in the life of society and of the individual.'<sup>2</sup> - We proceed to examine the Old Testament equivalent to the central concept of the gospel of the historical Jesus, i.e. 'kingdom of heaven', namely: the kingship of Yahweh.

---

<sup>1</sup> RGG III, art. Mahlzeiten, kultische, col. 607.

<sup>2</sup> S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 120.



## 2 The Kingship of Yahweh

The basis of our knowledge concerning the concept of the 'kingship of Yahweh' (malkuth YHWH) is the so-called 'enthronement psalms', namely Pss xlvii, xciii, xcvi, xcvi, xcvi, xcvi, xcix, and Pss xcv, lxxxi, which to a certain extent also belong to this group.<sup>1</sup> S. MOWINCKEL says, 'The characteristic phrase in the enthronement psalms proper - one which often appears in the introduction - is "Yahweh has become King", Yahweh malakh (93.1; 97.1; 47.8; 96.10).'<sup>2</sup> Thus we read, e.g., in Ps xcvi. 1-5:

Yahweh has become King! Let the earth rejoice;  
let the many shores be glad thereof.  
Clouds and darkness are round about him;  
equity and justice are the fundament of his throne.  
Fire blazes in front of him  
and burns his enemies round about.  
His lightnings illumined the world;  
till earth shivered at the sight.  
The mountains melted just like wax  
before the Lord of all the earth.<sup>3</sup>

S. MOWINCKEL's translating of the expression 'Yahweh malakh' by 'Yahweh has become King' gave rise to some objections by other Old Testament scholars. H. J. KRAUS, using 1 Kg 1.18 as his 'proof-text', concludes, 'If we see this very remarkable variation of the sequence of words in a wider context, the acclamation Yahweh malakh occurring in the royal psalms of Yahweh is to be translated by the words "Yahweh is King". A state, not an action is expressed.'<sup>4</sup> This judgment, we believe, displays a lack of understanding of the essential character of the festival cult, which MOWINCKEL describes in these words, '... the festival cult invariably has a more or less dramatic character; it is a sacred drama, representing the

---

1 Cf. S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 106; G. VON RAD, Basileia, (BKW) London 1957, p. 10.

2 S. MOWINCKEL, *ibid.*, p. 107.

3 Trans. by S. MOWINCKEL, *cf. ibid.*, p. 109.

4 H. J. KRAUS, Gottesdienst, p. 240

salvation which takes place. This dramatic character tallies with the fact that the cult is a mutual act on the part of God and of the congregation, with address and answer, action and reaction.<sup>1</sup> Thus, we believe, MOWINCKEL is right in rejecting a purely 'static' understanding of that expression.<sup>2</sup>

R. DE VAUX points out that 'even in Babylonian texts, and in those Egyptian texts which can be compared with them, the words "Marduk is King" are not a formula of enthronement either: they are an acclamation, a recognition of Marduk's power: he acts as king.' Therefore DE VAUX concludes, 'The biblical formula has the same meaning; it too is an acclamation, like the cry "Long live the King : ", which was used at the crowning of kings in Israel; it did not make the man king; it merely acknowledged the royal character of the new Anointed of Yahweh.'<sup>3</sup> It cannot be denied, for linguistic reasons, that this possibility - which is considered also by KRAUS but rejected<sup>4</sup> - is a real possibility.

On the other hand, Ps xlvii. 5-9 clearly depicts a cultic act of enthronement of Yahweh:<sup>5</sup>

God has gone up ('alah) with a shout,  
the Lord with the sound of a trumpet.  
Sing praises to God, sing praises!  
Sing praises to our King, sing praises!

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 19.

2 Cf. Psalms II, p. 222/23, Additional Note VI; esp.: 'In the first place we may take for granted that the Massoretes had a definite intention and gave expression to a traditional interpretation when they vocalized the word as a verb in the perfect, malakh, and not a noun melek, which would make a nominal clause ... The MT would suggest an activity, not a state.' (p. 222)

3 R. DE VAUX, Ancient Israel, p. 505.

4 See H. J. KRAUS, Gottesdienst, p. 240.

5 Cf. JOHN GRAY, The Kingship of God in the Prophets and Psalms, in: VT XI, Leiden 1961, p.2, n.1: 'This variant (sc. Ps xlvii. 6a) to the formula Yahweh malakh militates against EISSFELDT's contention that malakh is a stative perfect, "Jahwe als König", ZAW xlv, 1928, pp. 81ff. The analogy of the use of the perfect of the same verb in the acclamation of Absalom (2 Sam. xv. 10), Adonijah (1 Kings i. 11, 18), and Jehu (2 Kings ix. 13) supports the view of MOWINCKEL that the reference is to a cultic act signifying the assumption of royal power or the epiphany of Yahweh as King, Offersang og Sangoffer, 1951, pp. 523-526.' Even H. J. KRAUS cannot deny that the motif of enthronement is present in Ps xlvii, but he assumes that this motif stems from the enthronement of an earthly king. (See *ibid.*, p. 240, n.59)



For God is the king of all the earth;

sing praises with a psalm:

God reigns (malakh 'elohim) over the nations;

God sits on his holy throne (yashabh 'al-kiššē' qhadhosho).

The princes of the peoples gather

as the people of the God of Abraham.

For the shields of the earth belong to God;

he is highly exalted (m<sup>e</sup> odh na<sup>a</sup> lah).

S. MOWINCKEL's view about the 'place of life' of the 'enthronement psalms' is this:

Our thesis then will be that even on the basis of the special group of "enthronement festival of Yahweh, presupposed by them, could not be a separate, as yet unknown festival, but must have been the old festival of harvest and new year, the "feast of tabernacles". We have not here a newly discovered festival, not referred to elsewhere in the Old Testament, but a hitherto unheeded aspect of the well-known and frequently mentioned feast of tabernacles in its character of new year festival. - We have already seen that the enthronement festival of Yahweh and the feast of tabernacles and of New Year have in common the ideal of Yahweh's "appearance" and "epiphany", of the renewal of nature and creation, of the repeated "work of salvation" to be performed by him, and of Yahweh's universal dominion over the earth (cf. Ps. 65).<sup>1</sup>

The concept of Yahweh's 'malkuth', i.e. 'dominion', or 'royal sovereignty', or 'kingship', has various shades of meaning in the Old Testament, and is no doubt of pre-Israelitic origin. 'When Israel was gathered into one state,' S. MOWINCKEL says, 'and acquired its chief national holy place in Jerusalem, Yahweh was looked upon as the king of Zion. There is every reason to believe that the conception of Yahweh as the king of the township derives from the

1 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 121; the author's view concerning the development of this festival, in brief, is this: To the original agricultural festival, i.e. 'the feast of ingathering at the end of the year' (Ex xxiii.16), two new conceptions were added, viz. 'enthronement' and 'atonement', which in Jewish times became the main features of three festivals following close upon one another, namely:

1. Tishri 1st: new year feast, or 'the memorial of blowing the trumpets';
2. Tishri 10th: the feast of atonement;
3. Tishri 15th-21st: the feast of tabernacles. (Cf. *ibid.*, p. 120). See also: R. DE VAUX, Ancient Israel, pp. 496ff.; H. J. KRAUS, Gottesdienst, pp. 79ff.



supreme Canaanite deity in Jerusalem, El Elyon, whom Yahweh succeeded, and whose throne and realm he won, with David's conquest of the city and introduction of the worship of Yahweh as the official cult of the kingdom; this becomes still clearer in the new "royal temple" of Solomon.<sup>1</sup> El Elyon, 'the most high god' who was widely worshipped in Canaan and Syria, was also the sun god. The fact pointed out by MOWINCKEL, that Yahweh's temple at Jerusalem 'was built as a temple of the sun with its opening towards the east, so that the sun at the equinoxes shone straight through the open gates in towards "the Holy of Holies", where "He would dwell in the thick darkness", according to Solomon's inaugural prayer',<sup>2</sup> confirms Yahweh's succession to El Elyon's throne.

However, the El-tradition is not the only one taken over by the Yahweh of the pre-exilic temple cult from previous religious development. In a recent investigation into the origin of the royal title of Yahweh, which he based on the texts from the town of Ugarit (Ras Shamra) in Phoenicia, WERNER SCHMIDT found that the feature of Yahweh's kingship emphasized by S. MOWINCKEL stems not from the El but from the Baal-tradition.<sup>3</sup> 'Thus', SCHMIDT says, 'over against El (according to the texts known so far) emerges a fundamental difference: El is king, Baal becomes king. El's kingship is timeless-unchangeable; Baal must acquire his kingship, safeguard it by the building of a temple, defend it against enemies; nevertheless he loses it but finally arises anew as king. El's kingship is static, Baal's dynamic.'<sup>4</sup>

El S. MOWINCKEL seems to suggest that already in pre-Israelite times the decisive feature of Baal merged in Baal in that the latter was thought to become 'the King'.<sup>5</sup> Over against this, W. SCHMIDT holds that the Ras Shamra texts exclude the idea of an enthronement

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 114.

2 *ibid.*, p. 133.

3 W. SCHMIDT, Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel, Zur Herkunft der Königsprädikation Jahwes, (Beihefte ZAW 80) Berlin 1961.

4 *ibid.*, p. 22.

5 Cf. S. MOWINCKEL, *ibid.*, p. 132/33; see also W. SCHMIDT, *ibid.*, p. 23, n.44.

of El but make the cultic performance of Baal's enthronement, at regular intervals, highly probable.<sup>1</sup> It is worth noting, furthermore, that Baal is thought to live on Mount Zaphon, which O. EISSFELDT identified with the ancient Mons Casius, represented today by the dschebel el-aqra, a mountain in northern Syria.<sup>2</sup> 'There', W. SCHMIDT explains, he (sc. Baal) reigns as King after his victory over his enemies; for there is his sanctuary, his palace or temple, with his throne.<sup>3</sup> Ps xlviii. 1-3 suggests that ancient Israel adopted the Baal-tradition for Yahweh, and that by way of identifying Mount Zion with Mount Zaphon:

Great is the Lord and greatly to be praised  
in the city of our God!  
His holy mountain, beautiful in elevation,  
is the joy of all the earth,  
Mount Zion, in the far north (zaphon),  
the city of the great King (melekh rabh).  
Within her citadels  
God has shown himself a sure defense.<sup>4</sup>

We may ask here the question: When Jesus called together the inner circle of his disciples at Capernaum, formed a sort of 'procession', turned 'north' and 'went up on the mountain' - was he inspired by Ps lxviii? Although it is very likely that Jesus had in mind a concept of a 'holy mountain', of course, we cannot be certain that he actually was inspired by the Baal-tradition. A fact is, however, that Jesus 'quotes' the unusual expression which in Ps lxviii follows right after the term 'Zaphon' in the Sermon on the Mount, namely, 'the city of the great king' (Mt v.35).

1 Cf. W. SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 24/25; the ref. is to O. EISSFELDT, Baal Zaphon, Zeus Kasios und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer, Halle 1932.

3 W. SCHMIDT, *ibid.*, p. 24.

4 Note the following divergency of the geographical facts from the theological concept of the 'holy mountain': Jerusalem is built on four mountains, namely Mount Zion (the highest), Mount Moria, Mount Acra, and Mount Bezetha. Of these, Mount Moria actually was the Temple Mount, whereas Mount Zion was occupied by David's palace in ancient times, and in the time of Jesus, 'At the north-western angle of Mount Zion, the ancient Salem and Jebus, on the site of the **castle of David**, was the grand palace of Herod, generally occupied by the Roman procurators during their temporary sojourn in Jerusalem.' (A. EDERSHEIM, Temple, p. 33/34).



In this connection attention may be drawn also to the inaugural vision of Isaiah, vi. 1-13, which contains a description of the enthroned heavenly King: 'I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up; and his train filled the temple. Above him stood the seraphim; each had six wings: with two he covered his face, and with two he covered his feet, and with two he flew. And one called to another and said:

"Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts;  
the whole earth is full of his glory."

... my eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts.' (1b-3, 5c) S. MOWINCKEL holds this vision to contain reminiscences of the actual temple cult.<sup>1</sup> The central feature of the passage is 'the theophany of Jahweh as King'.<sup>2</sup>

G. VON RAD points out that there were two different 'theologies' in ancient Israel concerning Yahweh's communion with his people: one was based on the old cultic tradition, according to which 'the Ark was understood as the throne of the invisibly present God', whilst the other was based on the tabernacle-tradition of the Priestly Document: 'The Tabernacle is neither the dwelling place of Jahweh himself nor of his name, but the place on earth where, for the time being, the appearance of Jahweh's glory meets with his people. 'ohel mo'ed, Tent of Meeting, is the proper designation most corresponding with the facts.'<sup>3</sup> However, the two 'theologies' seem to have merged already in the pre-exilic temple cult, perhaps in connection with the fusion of the El and the Baal-tradition: Solomon's temple was modelled after a temple of El and thus was a 'dwelling temple',<sup>4</sup> whereas the notion of Yahweh's 'coming' (cf. Pss. xcvi. 13, xcvi. 9) - His epiphany in 'glory' (kabodh) - links up with the feature of 'enthronement' current in the Baal-tradition. We may assume, then, that the two conceptions of 'dwelling' and 'coming' - although of different origin - are not exclusive.<sup>5</sup>

1 Cf. S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms II, p. 147.

2 J. GRAY, art. cit., p. 1.

3 G. VON RAD, Studies in Deuteronomy (ET) London 1953, p. 39.

4 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 42, and 1 Kg viii.12; 2 Kg ix.15.

5 Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 38/39: the Deuteronomy 'corrects' these two conceptions in the sense that 'it is not Jahweh himself who is present at the shrine, but only his name as the guarantee of his will to save; to it and it only Israel has to hold fast as the sufficient form in which Jahweh reveals himself. Deuteronomy is replacing the old crude idea of Jahweh's presence and dwelling at the shrine by a theologically sublimated idea.'



By now it has become very probable that the notion of Yahweh's royal entry and enthronement in the temple was adopted by Israel, and that at the time of the ancient monarchy.<sup>1</sup> Of course, there was no question of Israel taking over the whole 'cultic pattern' of the original traditions unchanged.<sup>2</sup> If the concept of Yahweh's kingship had its roots in various mythical ideas,<sup>3</sup> Israel's tendency was to re-interpret the epic myths in terms of her experience of Yahweh in history.<sup>4</sup> Whereas the fundamental thought of the cult drama both in Babylonian-Assyrian and in Canaanite religion was the death and resurrection of the godhead, this was felt to be impossible in Israel. S. MOWINCKEL says, 'This radical exclusion of the thought of the deity's death and resurrection has certainly made the thought of Yahweh's yearly repeated enthronement less logical, but at the same time more deeply religious and realistic.'<sup>5</sup>

It is of great importance both for the 'Way of the Lord' of Deutero-Isaiah and - we believe - for the original Sermon on the Mount of Jesus, that 'the fundamental thought in the festal experience and the festal myth is that Yahweh is coming'.<sup>6</sup> Through His festal epiphany at the turning of the year, salvation becomes a present reality:

Yahweh hath 'made known' his salvation,

hath 'revealed' his saving victory. (Ps xcvi. 2)

God is within her citadels,

hath 'made himself known' as a defence. (Ps xlviii. 4)

God hath 'made himself known' in Judah,

his 'name' is great in Israel.

In Salem is now his pavilion,

In Zion his abode. (Ps lxxvi. 2f.)<sup>7</sup>

1 Cf. S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 125; G. VON RAD, Basileia, p. 9/10; A. R. JOHNSON, Sacral Kingship, p. 35.

2 Cf. S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 136.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 134-36.

4 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 139.

5 *ibid.*, p. 138; see however G. WIDENGREN, Sakrales Königtum im Alten Testament und im Judentum, Stuttgart 1955, pp. 63ff., who maintains that the thought of the deity's death and resurrection was included in Israel's festival.

6 *ibid.*, p. 142.

7 S. MOWINCKEL's trans., *ibid.*, p. 142.

In the New Year Festival Israel experiences Yahweh's 'saving works' (<sup>e</sup>t<sup>e</sup> shu<sup>3</sup>oth, <sup>e</sup>g<sup>e</sup> dhaqoth). 'They are the "message" of the festival. The term "glad tidings" (bart) was already used in Ugarit about the announcement that Baal had again become alive, and in the same terms the cultic festival announced to Israel the appearance of Yahweh as king and his enthronement (Ps. 96.2, cf. Isa. 52.7).'<sup>1</sup>

We quote here from Ps xcvi the verses 1-3, which express the saving experience of the cult community (1) and the urgency 'to pass on the knowledge of the miraculous saving deeds of God to "all nations", so that his majestic power may be praised (2-3)'.<sup>2</sup>

O sing to the Lord a new song;  
sing to the Lord, all the earth!  
Sing to the Lord, bless his name;  
tell (bas<sup>e</sup> ru) of his salvation from day to day.  
Declare his glory among the nations,  
his marvellous works among all the peoples!

The reason for the joyful new song and the message of salvation is the cultic manifestation of Yahweh's kingship:

Say among the nations, "Yahweh became king!  
Yea, the world is established, it shall never be moved;  
he will judge the peoples with equity." (vs. 10)

This verse reveals the nature of Yahweh's kingship: according to the basic belief of Israel, it was universal, cosmic. The background of Old Testament universalism is the 'myth of creation', which is the fundamental myth of the enthronement festival. 'Yahweh has become King of the world, because he has created it.'<sup>3</sup> A. WEISER comments on Ps xcvi. 10, 'The proclamation of the kingship of God is linked up with the declaration of the two foundation-pillars of the realization of his salvation - creation and judgment - so that the idea of judgment here appears as the sequel of the idea of the universe. The order of nature in creation and the order of History in judgment are planned by God in such a way that they are tuned to each other and

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 142/43.

2 A. WEISER, Psalms, p. 629.

3 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 143; cf. Is xlv. 18.



supplement each other, both being directed towards their common goal, and that goal is the realization of the 'righteousness of God' in his plan of salvation.<sup>1</sup>

Thus MOWINCKEL rightly sums up 'blessing', 'life', 'peace' and 'salvation' in the expression 'gifts of the kingdom', and declares the attainment of these gifts to be the purpose of the temple cult in Israel.<sup>2</sup> The assumption that these gifts belong together and that they are the fruit of Yahweh's kingship is confirmed by the passage Is lii.7, which may be called an 'imitation' of the cultic message of salvation, or, cultic poetry:<sup>3</sup>

How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet  
of him who brings good tidings (m<sup>e</sup>bhaser), who publishes peace,  
Who brings good tidings (m<sup>e</sup>bhaser) of good, who publishes salvation,  
who says to Zion, "Your God became king."

In this connection we must stress the point that Yahweh's epiphany in the midst of his congregation, or from the point of view of man, the pilgrim's encounter and joyful surrender to the divine King, is eo ipso salvation. This is clearly reflected in Ps xcv.1-3:<sup>4</sup>

O come, let us sing to the Lord;  
let us make a joyful noise to the rock of our salvation.  
Let us come into his presence with thanksgiving;  
let us make a joyful noise to him with songs of praise!  
For the Lord is a great God,  
and a great King above all Gods.

But what is, then, the meaning and place of the sacrifices which are to be offered at New Year (Num xxix. 1-6), on the Day of Atonement (7-11) and on each successive day of the Feast of Booths (12-38)? The stereotyped expression 'a pleasing odour to the Lord', which appears

1 A. WEISER, *Psalms*, p. 630.

2 See *PSALMS I*, p. 162; for the nature of the 'blessings' cf. e.g. Ps lxxv; vs.1 shows that this hymn was sung in the temple of Jerusalem.

3 Against H. J. KRAUS (see also R. DE VAUX, *Ancient Israel*, p. 505) cf. G. VON RAD, *Theology I*, p. 363, n. 15: 'After the conviction had become fairly well established that there was such a festival (sc. Enthronement) in the pre-exilic monarchical period, H. J. KRAUS again pleaded for the dependence of the Enthronement Psalms on Deutero-Isaiah (especially Is LII. 7-10).'

4 Cf. A. WEISER, *Psalms*, p. 626, ad loc.



throughout these texts, seems to indicate that these sacrifices were conceived mainly as (a) gifts to Yahweh and (b) a means of entering into communion with him. "The "expiatory" character of a l l sacrifice is a comparatively late development"<sup>1</sup>, and even the sin offering on the Day of Atonement was believed 'to make expiation for such sins as might have been committed unwittingly during the year preceding' only.<sup>2</sup> In other words, 'By the rites of this Day, the life of Israel was freed from everything that inhibited a healthy relationship with God and the communication of the divine blessing with its attendant peace. It has been noted that the work of atonement is not something that man does to propitiate God, but man's use of the medium which God has provided so that he may without danger to himself enter into the realm of the holy.'<sup>3</sup>

The main issue of Yahweh's kingship which is manifested in the cult is pointed out by G. VON RAD, when he says: 'In the Old Testament as in the New, the offer of salvation confronted those to whom it was made with the question of obedience.'<sup>4</sup> That is to say: The pilgrims who experienced Yahweh's saving presence in the cult, here also encountered his demanding will. The way in which this was done in Israel gave rise to a peculiar feature in the New Year festival, namely the renewal of the covenant, which was missing in other countries in the ancient Near East.<sup>5</sup> S. MOWINCKEL explains, 'The idea itself is not new; in ancient Israel all cult was in the nature of a strengthening of the covenant; "life" just meant covenant. But what was originally thought of was the, so-to-speak, n a t u r a l covenant, made up of family and tribe in connexion with the ancestors and the family god. To Israel after the time of Moses, "covenant" means the historical covenant which Yahweh in his goodness "granted" to his means the historical covenant which Yahweh in his goodness "granted" to his elected people.'<sup>6</sup>

---

1 TWBB, art. Sacrifice, p. 206.

2 *ibid.* p. 213.

3 A. S. HERBERT, Worship in Ancient Israel, (first publ. 1959; 2nd. impr.:) London 1961, p. 45.

4 G. VON RAD, Theology I, p. 196.

5 Cf. S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 155: where the author says that the 'covenant' 'is maybe the most important innovation on the basis of the historical orientation of Yahwism.'

6 *ibid.*

In Ps xcix, 6-8. we find the ideas of the renewal of the covenant and the question of obedience together:

His priests have still a Moses and an Aaron,  
 his worshippers have still a Samuel,  
 and Yahweh answers when they call to him,  
 Thou Yahweh, our God, Thou answerest them.  
 In the cloudy pillar doth he speak to them,  
 when they obey the laws and rules he gave them.  
 A forgiving God hast Thou ever been to them,  
 and one who has (not) avenged their evil deeds.

'What is meant is this', MOWINCKEL says, 'again there is a Moses, an Aaron, a Samuel, among his people; again he shall answer from the pillar of the cloud, whenever the leaders and intercessors of the people shall cry out to him. The covenant bringing happiness and help and forgiveness of sins to all who keep the commandments of Yahweh has again been established as a result of the enthronement of Yahweh.'<sup>1</sup>

The adoption of the Sinai-covenant about the time of the Deuteronomy, is an expression of the historical re-orientation of the temple cult in Israel over against the mythical background of the old Canaanite festival. In other words, 'demythologizing' was the reason for this innovation. Thus, the content of the 'psalm of epiphany' in Dt xxxiii. 2, 4f. was probably meant to replace the myth of the dying and rising again of the deity, which in Mesopotamia was the main feature of the enthronement feast:

From Mount Sinai Yahweh came,  
 from Se'ir he dawned on us,  
 from Paran's range he gleamed out  
 moving from Meribath-Kadesh ....  
 The congregation of Jacob became his domain,  
 and he became king in Jeshurun,  
 as the chiefs of the people there gathered,  
 and all the clans of Israel.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> IBID. p. 156; (Ps xcix. 6-8 is in MOWINCKEL's trans.)

<sup>2</sup> S. MOWINCKEL's trans.; see Psalms I, p. 154/55.



The stanza Ex xv. 17-18, part of 'a festal psalm put in the mouth of Miriam', reveals - besides the myth of creation - a second basis of Yahweh's kingship:

'Thou tookest thy folk and plantedst them into thine own hill,  
thou madest a shrine for thy dwelling, Yahweh,  
a sanctuary thy hands founded, O Lord:  
now Yahweh is king for evermore.

What Yahweh has done for Israel in actual history forms the basis of his kingship, and is recalled when in the new year festival he takes his seat on his throne as the victorious king.<sup>1</sup> The new year psalm which most clearly shows the relation between the successive scenes in the drama of this festival is Ps. xcv. 1-5: enthronement as king; 6-7a: homage before the creator and Lord of the covenant; 7b-11: renewal of the covenant, call to obedience and warning against disobedience.<sup>2</sup>

As this section is supposed to lead up to Jesus' 'gospel of the kingdom', and, more especially, to the discussion of chapter VI, Jesus and the Temple, the following three points may be stressed: (1) 'It is a necessary precondition that the God-King possesses a temple as palace. Divine kingship and temple are inseparable.'<sup>3</sup> Of special interest in this connection is Ps cxxxii.14 - which has a close parallel in the Ras Shamra texts - and clearly refers to the temple.<sup>4</sup> We quote here verse 14 together with vss. 13 and 17:

For the Lord has chosen Zion;  
he has desired it for his habitation;  
"This is my resting place for ever;  
here I will dwell, for I have desired it. ...  
There I will make a horn to sprout for David;  
I have prepared a lamp for my anointed (lim<sup>e</sup> shihi). ..."

(2) 'The history of the title "King" discloses itself as a slow but radical process of demythologizing. The mythological conception of a god as king over the other gods becomes Israel's faith in the King Yahweh who is graciously turned to her and at the same time is the Lord of the earth and the nations. King is now the Lord who dwells on Zion in the midst of his people.'<sup>5</sup>

---

1 *ibid.* p. 155.

2 The last aspect of the New Year festival, i.e. the renewal of the covenant, will be discussed below, chapter IV. 3.

3 W. SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 57; cf. also *ibid.*, n. 221.

4 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 58.

5 *ibid.*, p. 75.



(3) The last point answers the question raised by the two previous statements, namely: How could Israel be certain about Yahweh's choice of Zion and thus of herself? Over against H. J. KRAUS, who 'thinks he has proved that 2 Sam. 6 is really the hieros logos of the new cultic metropolis of Jerusalem', S. MOWINCKEL emphasizes the conception of the 'legitimizing theophany': 'An Israelite hieros logos would seek to justify the choice of a particular sanctuary by marking it out through a theophany; ...'<sup>1</sup>

In the Old Testament, the exact nature of Yahweh's kingship, i.e. as to its universalistic or particularistic interpretation, seems to be no problem.<sup>2</sup> The reason for this fact - which for the modern mind merely indicates a lack of precise definition - lies in the mythical background of this concept.<sup>3</sup> The Israelitic tendency of 'historizing' the enthronement festival, however, caused the particularistic understanding to become more prominent. 'In the first instance the historical reference, to which the festival myths bear witness on all points, implies that the idea of Yahweh's kingship is once more limited to Israel in practice. ... But in spite of all this, Yahweh's universal dominion nowhere stands out so clearly as in the enthronement psalms, and consequently also his superiority over all other gods. It seems as if the poets cannot help imagining that all the world would rejoice in this just as much as they themselves do. Thus these psalms point forward to the New Testament conception of the "kingdom" of God, even if the Old Testament limits have not yet been exceeded.'<sup>4</sup>

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms II, p. 238; cf. 1 Kg viii. 10-11.

2 Cf. G. VON RAD, Basileia, p. 11: 'The exact nature of Yahweh's kingdom, however, is not discernible from the majority of the passages. The many predications in the hymns are mostly silent as to whether Yahweh is understood to be King of Israel or King of the world.'

3 See above p. 96.

4 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 161; cf. also W. SCHMIDT, *op.cit.*, p. 79, n. 72: '... Hence the enthronement psalms unite Israelite and Canaanite features. Thus the "coexistence" of "particularism" (Israel) and "universalism" (Canaan) is explained...'

A sketch about Yahweh's royal sovereignty, his malkuth, in ancient Israel, cannot really be concrete, as long as the decisive question is left unanswered, namely: H o w does Yahweh actually exercise His kingship? H o w does he rule His people, and h o w is He supposed to teach the peoples of all nations His ways? In order to answer these questions, we must turn our attention to the following concept, i.e. to Yahweh's representative person in the cult, His 'son', and to the question about the nature of their mutual relationship.

---

### 3 The sonship of the king

In his study about the earliest Christian confessions of faith, OSCAR CULLMANN points out that the words of the Ethiopian in Acts viii. 37, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God", are 'one of the earliest confessions of faith we know.'<sup>1</sup> R. BULTMANN holds a similar view, when he says, 'the earliest Church called Jesus Son of God (messianic) because that was what the resurrection made him', and reconstructs the 'handed-down formula' contained in Rom i.3f. as follows:

"(Jesus Christ) the Son of God,  
Come from the seed of David,  
Designated Son of God  
in power by his resurrection from the dead."<sup>2</sup>

However, although the Christological concept 'Son of God' has received much attention in recent theological discussion,<sup>3</sup> the important question as to whether or not Jesus himself used the concept and under which aspect has not yet been answered conclusively.<sup>4</sup>

It is well known that the concept 'son of God' is found both in the Old and in the New Testament (ben ʾelohim; υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ). And most scholars would agree with A. RICHARDSON, when he says, "The meaning of "Son of God" in the NT is based ... on its distinctive

---

1 O. CULLMANN, Die ersten christlichen Glaubensbekenntnisse, TS Heft 15 (2nd ed.) Zollikon-Zurich 1949, p. 15; cf. also *ibid.*, p. 14, n. 26.

2 R. BULTMANN, Theology I, p. 49/50.

3 See e.g., the monographs: J. BIENECK, Sohn Gottes als Christusbezeichnung der Synoptiker, Zurich 1951; B.M.F. VAN IERSEL, 'Der Sohn' in den Synoptischen Jesusworten, Leiden 1961; EVALD LÖVESTAM, Son and Saviour, A Study of Acts 13, 32-37. With an Appendix: 'Son of God' in the Synoptic Gospels, Lund 1961; and TH. DE KRUIJF, Der Sohn des Lebendigen Gottes, Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Matthäusevangeliums, Romae 1962. Cf. also O. CULLMANN, The Christology of the New Testament (ET) London 1963, ad rem.

4 Cf. H. ZAHNT, *op cit.*, p. 117: 'We do not in fact have any certain proof that Jesus himself used any of the titles, Son of God, Son of Man or Messiah, which were put in his mouth by later tradition.' Note, however, the following sentence: 'At the same time it is evidence that the hidden, indirect claim which underlies all his words and actions cannot be invented by others, but goes back to Jesus himself.'



use in the OT.<sup>1</sup> But until recently, namely, until the beginning of the 'new quest', too little attention has been paid to the intermediate stage of the development of this concept in the teaching of Jesus.

It is logical to think that the best approach to this stage would be via an investigation into the use of the Messianic designation 'Son of God' in contemporary sources. But this is not so. EVALD LÖVESTAM sums up his findings as follows: 'The negative evidence of the sources as regards the direct naming of the Messiah as God's son shows, however, that this was in any case not a usual title for the Messiah in early Judaism. Thus, the existing Judaic material does not point to the conclusion that it is merely a matter of a messianic title current at that time which was applied to Jesus when, as in the Gospels, he is called "God's Son". In this connection another circumstance must also be kept in mind. Both Judaism and Christianity certainly have their roots in the Old Testament. Now it has appeared above that in certain significant groups of Judaic writings at least, there is a clear tendency to play down the Old Testament God's son statements. If clear evidence should be forthcoming however, that in connection with certain Old Testament passages "God's son" was used in early Judaism as a messianic title, it by no means follows from this, that the naming of Jesus as God's Son in the New Testament should be entirely built upon this, or have its meaning determined from it. The Primitive Church, in relation to Judaism, used the Old Testament in a principally independent manner (cf. 2 Cor. 3:14ff.).<sup>2</sup> - We may add here: So did Jesus himself.

These findings are in accordance with the consideration that we cannot reach the historical Jesus by way of a 'Christological', or, 'Messianic' approach, i.e. by way of an analysis of 'titles'. The reason for this is that Jesus proclaims not himself but the 'kingdom of heaven'. Or, as we have seen in the previous section, the 'good tidings' is the coming of Yahweh Himself: 'Yahweh became King!'.<sup>3</sup> We have already suggested that the heavenly King in the temple cult

---

1 A. RICHARDSON, Theology, p. 148.

2 E. LÖVESTAM, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

3 See however G. GLOEGE, The Day of His Coming, i.e. the coming of 'the Man in the Gospel' (subtitle).

of ancient Israel was 'represented' by his 'son', i.e. the earthly king. According to our hypothesis, the concept of 'sonship' used in the Sermon on the Mount must be understood against that cultic background, and this means more concretely: from Pss ii. 7, lxxxix. 20-30, and cx. 3 (cf. also 2 Sam vii. 12-14).

COOKE The first point to be considered is the dating and the character of these psalms: Are they contemporary cult psalms, or merely later cultic poetry? In a recent essay, GERALD cooke discussed the question of dating and - referring to the various views of other Old Testament scholars - found that '... it is possible to examine the Nathan prophecy in both II Sam 7 and Ps 89 as data for the problem of divine kingship in pre-exilic Israelite religion.'<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, 'Ps 2 and 110 are Royal Psalms which were intended to refer to the earthly king during the monarchy. Any messianic interpretation in the fully eschatological sense espoused by BUTTENWIESER and DE FRAINE must be rejected.'<sup>2</sup> 'We may proceed, then', COOKE concluded, 'to an examination of the texts concerning the king's divine sonship with some confidence that our materials may be accepted as authentic representation of concepts which were articulated and utilized in the kingship period. The proponents of divine kingship can be met on their own ground in a test of their claims with respect to divine sonship.'<sup>3</sup> Although COOKE does not use the term 'cult psalm', there is little doubt about the 'place in life' of Pss ii, lxxxix and cx. According to S. MOWINCKEL, the decisive verses of these psalms - which we mentioned above - are to be regarded as 'enthronement' or 'anointed oracles'.<sup>4</sup> ment/

The second point to be clarified is the terminology used in discussions about the sonship of the king. As far as we can see, the adjective 'divine' is used ambiguously in COOKE's statement quoted above: in the expression 'divine sonship' it is an equivalent to 'son of God',

---

1 G. COOKE, The Israelite King as Son of God, in: ZAW, 73. Band, 1961, Heft 2, pp. 202-25, cit. p. 203. See however S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 63, and OAB, ad 2 Sam vii. lff., where dependence of 2 Sam vii. 12-14 on Ps lxxxix is assumed. Cf. also COOKE, *ibid.*, p. 203, n.8: 'The absence from Ps 89. 25-37 of many elements present in II Sam 7 belies direct literary dependence ...'.

2 *ibid.*, p. 205; the ref. is to M. BUTTENWIESER, The Psalms, Chronologically Treated with a New Translation, Chicago 1938, p. 793, and J. DE FRAINE, L'Aspect religieux de la royauté Israélite, Rome 1954, pp. 271, n. 4 and 274.

3 *ibid.*, p. 206.

4 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 63.



whereas in the expression 'divine kingship' it points to 'the divinity or deification of the Hebrew king'.<sup>1</sup> Of course, this ambiguity cannot be avoided if the adjective 'divine' is used, because it can be understood in both ways. But the vital question is this: Are we not introducing a modern differentiation into a concept of ancient Israel, when we ask concerning the 'figure' 'son of God': 'Are such figures to be taken metaphorically, or do they imply a belief in the king's essential divinity?'<sup>2</sup> Our view is this: As the expression 'son of God', or, the concept of divine sonship, is found in cult psalms, we have to do here not with an ontological but rather with a cultic expression. Or, to be quite clear: with a cult - functional concept. - We now proceed to examine as far as possible the sources from which ancient Israel drew the content of this concept, in order to understand its original meaning in the cult psalms.

In an interesting study A. R. JOHNSON discussed what H. WHEELER ROBINSON described as a 'corporate personality',<sup>3</sup> and its relation to and influence on the Old Testament concepts both of man and of God.<sup>4</sup> The facts are, in short these: In ancient Israel, 'the nucleus of the social unit or kin-group is the household, which is a psychical whole whole representing the extended personality of the man at its head.'<sup>5</sup> In a similar way, 'Yahweh was worshipped as a member, albeit the chief member, of a Pantheon', 'the heavenly Court or divine Assembly, at which the "Sons of God" or "Sons of the Gods", or, simply, "Gods" are said to present themselves before Yahweh.'<sup>6</sup> This conception is still evident, for example, in Pss xxix, 1-2 and lxxxix, 7-8:

Ascribe to Yahweh, O sons of gods (b<sup>e</sup> ne 'elim),

ascribe to Yahweh glory and strength.

Ascribe to Yahweh the glory of his name;

worship Yahweh in holy array.

For who in the skies can be compared to Yahweh?

Who among the sons of god (b<sup>e</sup> ne 'elim) is like Yahweh,

a God ('el) feared in the council of the holy ones,

great and terrible above all that are round about him?

---

1 Cf. G. COOKE, *ibid.*, p. 202.

2 *ibid.*, p. 224.

3 H. W. ROBINSON, *The Hebrew Concept of Corporate Personality*, in: *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*, ed. J. HEMPEL, 1936, pp. 49ff.

4 A. R. JOHNSON, *The One and the Many in the Israelite Concept of God*, Cardiff 1942.

5 *ibid.*, p. 12.

6 *ibid.*, p. 26.



The root of these parallel conceptions of God and man is the concept of 'complete personality' (nephesh), which 'is thought of as extending through his "bait", i.e. "house" or "household"'.<sup>1</sup> And as the father is the head of the house, it is not surprising that 'the ancient Semitic conception of the deity is that he is the "father" of the tribe or of the people'.<sup>2</sup> This is the background for Ex iv. 22, 23: 'And you shall say to Pharaoh, "thus says the Lord,

Israel is my first-born son, and I say to you, "Let my son go that he may serve me"; if you refuse to let him go, behold, I will slay your first-born son.'

Two points are important in this text, namely (a) Israel's sonship is 'based upon divine adoption or election (Jer. 31.9; Hos. 11.1)<sup>3</sup>, and (b) it is the function of the son to 'serve' (ʿabhadh) his father (ʾabh). That is to say, the two epithets 'son' (ben) and 'servant' (ʿebhedh) do not - to say the least - necessarily exclude each other.

The usual terms, however, which denote the 'master' of the household and the servant who acts as his agent, are 'lord' (ʾadhon) and 'messenger' (mal<sup>ḥ</sup>akh).<sup>4</sup> For example in Gen xlv. 10 we find a 'messenger' speaking: 'He said, "Let it be as you say: he with whom

it is found shall be my slave, and the rest of you shall be blameless."'

A. R. JOHNSON explains this scene as follows: 'Through the agency of his steward Joseph is regarded as being present - "in person". In short, the mal<sup>ḥ</sup>akh ("messenger"), as an "extension" of his master's personality, not merely represents but is virtually the adhon ("lord").'<sup>5</sup>

In the same way, 'the prophet was commonly thought of as the mal<sup>ḥ</sup>akh ("Messenger") of Yahweh par excellence, and might himself be virtually indistinguishable from Him in certain circumstances.'<sup>6</sup> The evidence for this is found, for example in Jer xxiii. 21, 22, where Jeremiah speaks as 'an active "Extension" of Yahweh's Personality, or, as Yahweh "in Person"':<sup>7</sup>

"I did not send the prophets,  
yet they ran;

---

1 A. R. JOHNSON, The One and the Many, p. 8.

2 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 114; cf. also Dt xxxii. 6f.: '... is he not your father, who created you...'

3 OAB, ad loc.

4 Cf. A. R. JOHNSON, *ibid.* p. 8.

5 *ibid.*, p. 9.

6 *ibid.*, p. 36.

7 *ibid.*, p. 37.

I did not speak to them,  
 yet they prophesied.  
 But if they had stood in my council,  
 then they would have proclaimed  
 my words to my people,  
 and they would have turned them  
 from their evil way,  
 and from the evil of their doings."

The extension of Yahweh's personality is often understood in terms of the 'Spirit' (ruah)<sup>1</sup>, which in Micaiah's vision (1 Kgs xxii. 19f.) is personalized as a member of Yahweh's heavenly court.<sup>2</sup> Over against Jeremiah's picture of the false prophet, we may quote here Mic iii. 8, a stanza which depicts the true prophet:

But as for me, I am filled with power,  
 with the Spirit of the Lord (ruah YHWH)  
 and with justice and might,  
 to declare to Jacob his transgression  
 and to Israel his sin.

It is not surprising that the gift of the Spirit is also associated with the function of the king. This finds clear expression in 'the Last Words of David', a hymn of praise the authenticity of which is disputed, but at least some of its stanzas may go back to David.<sup>3</sup> Omitting the last two verses, the text of which is very corrupt, we quote here 2 Sam xxiii. 1-5:

The oracle of David, the son of Jesse,  
 the oracle of the man who was raised on high,  
 the anointed (m<sup>e</sup> shiah) of the God of Jacob,  
 the sweet psalmist of Israel.  
 "The Spirit of the Lord (ruah YHWH) speaks by me,  
 his word upon my tongue.  
 The God of Israel has spoken,  
 the Rock of Israel has said to me:

1 Cf. A. R. JOHNSON, The One and the Many, p. 18f.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 20.

3 Cf. A. R. JOHNSON, Hebrew Conceptions of Kingship, in: Myth, Ritual, p. 209/10, and the same author's Sacral Kingship, pp. 14ff., esp. p. 15, n.2.

When one rules justly over men,  
 ruling in the fear of God,  
 he dawns on them like the morning light,  
 like the sun shining forth upon a cloudless morning,  
 like rain that makes grass to sprout from the earth.  
 Yea, does not my house stand so with God?  
 for he has made with me an everlasting covenant,  
 ordered in all things and secure.  
 For will he not cause to prosper  
 all my help and my desire?

In this hymn, the 'Spirit of the Lord' is mentioned together with the royal epithet 'the 'Anointed'. The relationship between the two expressions is evident from I Sam xvi. 13: 'Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brothers; and the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon David from that day forward.' The idea here is that the oil which was poured or smeared over David in this ritual symbolizes the divine power transmitted to the anointed, i.e. 'the Spirit of the Lord'.<sup>1</sup> Thus the rite of anointing marked the king out as a sacral person, i.e. a real and powerful extension of Yahweh's own personality.<sup>2</sup>

It is well known that, like the kings, the High Priest also was anointed with oil, but probably not the ordinary priests (cf. Ex xxix; Lev viii). This brings us to the question: Does being anointed, assure the king a role in the cult? And, parallel to this, Do the prophets, who were also thought of as Yahweh's extensions, fill a cultic role? The latter question was answered in the affirmative firstly by G. HÖLSCHER<sup>3</sup> and S. MOWINCKEL,<sup>4</sup> and their ideas were taken up and presented in English by A. R. JOHNSON.<sup>5</sup> The findings of these scholars are not undisputed, and H. H. ROWLEY therefore formulates his judgment very carefully: 'The prophet was always a

1 Cf. to this S. MOWINCKEL, He That Cometh, p. 4/5.

2 Cf. ERNST KUTSCH, Salbung als Rechtsakt, Im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient, (Beihefte ZAW 87) Berlin 1963. KUTSCH concludes that in Judah the people is the actual 'subject' of the king's anointing, whereas 'Anointed of Yahweh' merely is a 'Theologumenon', 'which expresses the close relationship with Yahweh and the appointment by Him.' (ibid., p. 71/72).

3 See G. HÖLSCHER, Die Propheten, Leipzig, 1914, p. 143.

4 See S. MOWINCKEL, Psalmstudien III, Kultprophetie und prophetische Psalmen, Christiania 1923, and now Psalms II.

5 See A. R. JOHNSON, The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel, Cardiff 1944.



sacred person because he was believed to be possessed by the spirit of God, but he was not necessarily, in virtue of being a prophet, appointed to a defined place in the worship of some shrine. Hence I accept the view that there were cultic prophets, without turning the major canonical prophets into members of such guilds.<sup>1</sup> We shall come back to the two most important points of this discussion, namely (a) some psalms were composed by cultic prophets to be used as ritual texts, and (b) they did this in a dual function, viz. as the spokesmen of Yahweh and as the representatives of the people.<sup>2</sup>

As to the part played by the king in the cult, the references in the Old Testament are more frequent than those about the prophets in this matter. We may recall, firstly, the story how David brought up the ark to its new place in his royal city, an event in which he obviously took the leading cultic role. This role consisted in offering sacrifices, in dancing 'before the Lord', in offering 'burnt offerings and peace offerings before the Lord', and in blessing the people 'in the name of the Lord' (cf. 2 Sam vi; 1 Chr xiii, xv, xvi). Even in this brief summary, the dual character of the cultic role of the king is evident: While acting 'before the Lord' (liph<sup>e</sup> ne YHWH; cf. paneh, i.e. face) he is the representative of the people before Yahweh; while acting 'in the name of the Lord' (b<sup>e</sup> shem YHWH; cf. shem, i.e. name, 'person') he is the representative of Yahweh, the 'Extension of his Person', before the people.<sup>3</sup>

In this connection, we may again quote S. MOWINCKEL who, as mentioned above, relates this scene to the new year and enthronement festival<sup>4</sup>: 'In the cult the king sings and dances "before Yahweh" at the head of the procession, and in the cultic drama he plays the part of David, while Yahweh is represented by his holy shrine, "the footstool" before the throne, where he sits invisible.<sup>5</sup> Even in Ps 110 where the king sits on Yahweh's own throne at his right hand, a clear distinction is

---

1 H. H. ROWLEY, Ritual and the Hebrew Prophets, in: Myth, Ritual, p. 259.

2 Cf. A. R. JOHNSON, Cultic Prophet, p. 63.

3 It is worth noting that, as God's representative, David not only 'distributed' a 'spiritual' but also 'material' blessings, cf. 2 Sam vi. 19; and that afterwards David returned to bless his household in the role of 'pater familias'.

4 Cf. above p. 77 and 81; the following cit. is from Psalms I, p. 59.

5 Cf. MOWINCKEL's note 67 added here: 2 Sam. 6.5, 14ff.; cf. Pss. 42.7; 132.1-10. For the throne in the Temple see Isa. 6.1f.; cf. Johs. Pedersen, Israel III-IV, pp. 247ff. H. Schmidt in Eucharisterion (Gunkel Festschrift) I, pp. 120ff.'

made between Yahweh and the king.' On the other hand, we may recall what MOWINCKEL says about the significance of the 'representative' in ancient Israel: 'He is not merely a casually chosen "representative" in our modern sense of the word. He could not be replaced by anybody else. He is the "representative" because the "soul", the history, the honour, the vigour and the blessing of the whole are concentrated in him. And, the other way round, all the others participate dynamically in what he represents.'<sup>1</sup> This is to say, although a clear distinction is made between the king and Yahweh, Israel nevertheless through the king encounters Yahweh Himself.

In this context, where we try to understand the difference between the expressions 'represented by' yet not 'identical with', we believe the conception of the 'extended personality' to offer the best terminological solution: Yahweh's anointed is Yahweh's 'extension' through which He exercises His kingship and blesses His people. The people receive the divine blessing by 'participation' in what the king represents. Now, the question arises, what is the most appropriate expression of the Old Testament for the special close relationship between the heavenly and the earthly king?

The answer to this question is found in the cult psalms mentioned at the beginning of the present section - namely Pss ii, lxxxix, cx - and reads 'sonship'. In the following statement, S. MOWINCKEL makes clear in what sense 'the sonship of the king' is unique among the relationships of the Old Testament, even if the term 'son' of Yahweh is used more widely: 'The supposed prophetic poet could not have let Yahweh say to the people of Israel that he has begotten him "today". That will fit only one person who "today", that is at the moment that the psalm is being sung, becomes what he is - Yahweh's "son" and king (Ps. 2.7). Israel, on the other hand, became Yahweh's "son" when Yahweh called him out of Egypt (Hos. 11.1). The

---

1 Psalms I, p. 43; cf. also p. 44: 'Within the nation the king is the representative of the whole. Israel is his "house" and he is its father. The covenant between Yahweh and Israel and between Yahweh and David is one and the same thing.' (Cf. Is iv. 3f.)



congregation is not "Yahweh's king", as the king in the psalms, but on the contrary, Yahweh is "the king of Israel".<sup>1</sup> How was 'the sonship of the king' understood in ancient Israel? As the concept of kingship and monarchy was taken over from the Canaanites and perhaps also from other nations in the Near East<sup>2</sup>, we have to examine the foreign concepts first, in order to recognise if and to what extent they were modified by Israel and consequently how the sonship of Yahweh's anointed was conceived.<sup>3</sup>

In Egypt, the sonship of the king was understood metaphysically in the sense that Pharaoh, i.e. the king, was divine by incarnation. With the changing worship of gods, and identified with them all<sup>4</sup>, he came to be regarded as the Son of Rē', the Son of Osiris and the Son of Horus, 'and so every living king was Horus, and every dead king was Osiris, for Osiris was the good king who had been murdered by his evil brother Seth, but whose throne had eventually been assigned to his son Horus as the result of the lawsuit before the gods themselves.'<sup>5</sup> Many kings came to the throne by normal succession from father to son. If there were doubts about the position of the heir, however, his accession could be assured by means of an oracle, by a dream, or by the fiction of a divine marriage, by which the future king was begotten.<sup>6</sup> MOWINCKEL holds that in Egypt the formula 'I have borne you' addressed to the heir 'is originally to be imagined as spoken by a female deity.'<sup>7</sup>

To sum up, we may quote the following passage by H. W. FAIRMAN: 'Whatever his origin, the king proved his direct link with the ancestors by performing the funeral ceremonies of his predecessor, thus showing himself acting as a dutiful son. The rites of the coronation not only made him the divine king, the presence of the royal ancestors showed that he was accepted by them, he was of their essence, he was filled with the spirit of the ancestors and in that spirit

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 47.

2 Cf. 1 Sam viii. 19b: ' "No! but we will have a king over us, that we also may be like all the nations, ..." '.

3 To the following compare S. MOWINCKEL, He That Cometh, pp. 22ff.; and Myth, Ritual.

4 Thus MOWINCKEL, *ibid.* p. 28.

5 H. W. FAIRMAN, The Kingship Rituals in Egypt, in: Myth, Ritual, p. 75.

6 *ibid.* p. 77.

7 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 54; the author's own ref. is to GUNKEL, Psalmen, p. 7.



he ruled unchallenged and unchallengeable.<sup>1</sup> MOWINCKEL explains, 'Behind this conception of kingship lies a thought which is found among many primitive peoples, and particularly among the Hamatic tribes of Africa, with whom the Egyptians had close ethnological and cultural connexions. The thought is that of a mana-filled chief of the type called "Rainmaker-king", who after death remains a source of power, and who, inter alia, is incarnated in his successor, though he himself also exists elsewhere, and acts in other ways.'<sup>2</sup>

For the Hittite conception of kingship it seems to have been characteristic that the king held also the office of a chief priest; he 'became priest of the gods' at his accession to the throne.<sup>3</sup> This implies that he represented his people in the cult and was held responsible for the expiation of their sins. In prayer by king Murilis II, the king in his role as representative of his people 'comes before the gods in all humility, likening himself to a servant. He claims indeed to be sinless himself, but none the less is willing to assume the guilt of his father in order to appease the anger of the gods.'<sup>4</sup> Another interesting feature is that every Hittite king 'had his divine patron, by whom he claimed to be "beloved".'<sup>5</sup> The question of the king's divinity is not quite clear. His succession to kingship was dependent in the Old Kingdom 'on an act of nomination by the reigning monarch', and later probably on divine choice 'among the king's sons'.<sup>6</sup> At any rate there was a 'Festival of Enthronement', the ceremonies of which included the anointing of the king 'with the fine oil of kingship'.<sup>7</sup> Finally, it is a 'fact that the Hittite king "became a god" at death and cannot therefore have been one during his lifetime'.<sup>8</sup>

We may add here a brief summary of S. MOWINCKEL's discussion of kingship in Mesopotamia.<sup>9</sup> 'Kingship developed in the earliest Sumerian cities from a primitive patriarchal democracy, under the leadership of the elders. The real "lord" is the god of the city.'<sup>10</sup> The dominant thought is that of choice and the king is accordingly created by the gods and

---

1 H. W. FAIRMAN, art. cit. p. 104.

2 S. MOWINCKEL, *He That Cometh*, p. 31; cf. HENRI FRANKFORT, *Kingship and the Gods, A Study of Ancient Near East Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature*, Chicago 1948.

3 O. R. GURNEY, *Hittite Kingship*, in: *Myth, Ritual*, p. 105.

4 *ibid.*, p. 111/112.

5 *ibid.*, p. 115.

6 *ibid.*, p. 119.

7 *ibid.*, p. 118.

8 *ibid.*, p. 119/20.

9 See *He That Cometh*, pp. 32ff.

10 *ibid.*, p. 33.

goddesses; they 'fashioned him with the hands in his mother's womb'.<sup>1</sup> 'Sonship signifies an intimate relationship of trust and obedience. As a "son" the king is an object of care, love, and protection from the god or goddess (or from all the gods); and he owes them filial obedience in their service.'<sup>2</sup> Thus he is a 'son' by adoption in spite of the formula, 'You are my son, whom I have begotten'. As the head of the priests, he is responsible for the relation between the people and the gods, 'he is the connecting link, representing both the god and the people'.<sup>3</sup> In the cultic drama of the New Year festival, which depicts a life and death struggle between the powers of chaos and the power of nature, the king represents the latter as 'one who shares in the power and nature of the gods'.<sup>4</sup> To sum up the king's vocation and task: 'We often find the king presenting himself as "the saving shepherd" (re'u mushallimu), or "the shepherd who brings justice", "the righteous or just shepherd", as Hammurabi calls himself; just as it is often said of the gods that they "save", i.e., provide all the good things which are needed for life and well-being'.<sup>5</sup>

The concept of kingship in C a n a a n seems to be very similar to that in Mesopotamia; again we find the king to be 'the especially chosen and trusted "servant" and "son" of the supreme god', whose name is El.<sup>6</sup> Peculiar to the New Year festival in Canaan is the sacred marriage, which is the chief feature of the cult drama.<sup>7</sup> Of special interest for our context of enthronement and royal psalms is the festal myth. 'The entire religion was dominated by the idea of the dying and rising fertility god, by the thought of "life out of death". The myth and the cultic drama describe how Baal dies in the conflict with Mot, the power of death, and how his beloved, "the virgin Anath", searches for him, how he defeats Mot, how Baal rises again or is born again in the son he begets by Anath, and, further, how he defeats the hostile powers of chaos, is enthroned on

---

1 *ibid.*, p. 33.

2 *ibid.*

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 38, cit. p. 50.

4 Cf. pp. 32 and 50.

5 *ibid.*, p. 47.

6 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 54 (about king Karit).

7 *ibid.*, p. 53.

the divine mountain in the north as king of gods and men, how he is united with Anath, the mother goddess and goddess of fertility, how he recreates the universe, symbolized by the restoration of his temple.<sup>1</sup>

We have to keep in mind these various features of the 'foreign' concepts of divine kingship and 'sonship' when we approach the corresponding Israelite concepts. One aspect, however, we should like to dismiss beforehand, namely concerning the question of whether or not the so-called 'Tammuz-story', i.e. the myth of the suffering god(s), which exercised a deep influence on the cult in Mesopotamia, was found also in Israel. About this, the opinions of the specialists are still divided. G. WIDENGREN, for example, sums up his findings concerning the connection between the cultic role of the king in Israel and the 'Tammuz motifs' as follows: 'We have seen that the king acts in the ritual as the representative of the god, who is dead, but rises again, is conquered by his enemies, but is at last victorious over them, and returns in triumph to his temple, creating cosmos, fertilizing earth, celebrating his marriage, sitting enthroned in his holy Tabernacle upon the mountain of the gods.'<sup>2</sup>

Over against this, S. MOWINCKEL states: 'In Israel the king became, not the one who helps the god to get life and power, but just the reverse, the representative of the whole body of the people, who himself gets all blessing, power and "life" from Yahweh because he is Yahweh's "anointed one", and "son", who passes on to the people the blessing which he has received from

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, He That Cometh, p. 53.

2 G. WIDENGREN, Early Hebrew Myths, in: Myth, Ritual, p. 199; for similar views see THEODORE ROBINSON, Hebrew Myths, in: Myth and Ritual (1st ed.), pp. 183ff.; and furthermore F. F. HVIDBERG, Graad og Latter i det Gamle Testamente, Copenhagen 1938; HVIDBERG's thesis about 'the allusions to a ritual weeping and laughing found in the Old Testament' is that, corresponding to a similar pattern found in Ugaritic texts, we have to do here with 'two emotional climaxes, that of laughter, associated with the celebration of the resurrection of the deity and his sacred marriage, and that of weeping, attached to the death of the deity' (G. WIDENGREN, art. cit. p. 179).



Yahweh through his anointing, and which is renewed for him and the body of the people through the coming of Yahweh in the cult.<sup>1</sup> MOWINCKEL's view is certainly more in keeping with the Old Testament conception of God, which - following A. R. JOHNSON - we tried to outline briefly at the beginning of this section. Hence we do not expect to find any trace of a 'suffering god' in the royal psalms and, more especially, in Ps ii, which is the context of the Israelite concept of sonship.

We quote here the full text of this psalm, indicating its four stanzas by the corresponding numbers of the vss.:

- (1-3)       Why do the nations conspire  
              and the peoples plot in vain?  
The kings of the earth set themselves,  
              and the rulers take counsel together,  
              against the Lord and his anointed (m<sup>e</sup> shi ho) saying,  
"Let us burst their bonds asunder,  
              and cast their cords from us."  
(4-6)       He who sits in the heavens laughs;  
              the Lord has them in derision.  
Then he will speak to them in his wrath,  
              and terrify them in his fury, saying,  
"I have set my king  
              on Zion, my holy hill."  
(7-9)       I will tell of the decree (hoq) of the Lord:  
              He said to me, "You are my son (b<sup>e</sup> ni <sup>a</sup> tah),  
              today I have begotten thee (<sup>a</sup> ni hayom y<sup>e</sup> lidhtikha).  
Ask of me, and I will make the nations your heritage,  
              and the ends of the earth your possession.  
You shall break them with a rod of iron,  
              and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 138; cf. J. PEDERSEN, *Israel III-IV*, pp. 84ff.; and A. R. JOHNSON, *Hebrew Conception of Kingship*, in: *Myth, Ritual*, p. 233/34, where the author says against G. WIDENGREN's view: 'For my own part I must say that I find nothing in the evidence cited which warrants such a view; and in my opinion one of the basic mistakes made in this connexion is that of taking the Hebrew text too literally and with insufficient regard for the use of idiom or purely figurative language'.

(10-12) Now therefore, O kings, be wise;  
           be warned, O rulers of the earth.  
 Serve the Lord with fear,  
           with trembling kiss his feet,  
 lest he be angry and you perish in the way;  
           for his wrath is quickly kindled.  
 Blessed are all who take refuge in him.

For a brief summary concerning 'place in life' and content of this psalm, we may quote A. WEISER: 'The psalm was composed for the occasion of the enthronement of a king of Judah at Jerusalem in the time after David. Its author, a master of words full of great poetical power and bold ideas, is probably to be thought of as belonging to the circle of the court-poets of the king. The psalm, which was probably designed to be used again and again, confronts the rebellion of the kings of the earth (first strophe) with the transcendent grandeur of God (second strophe), and it does so with a few powerful strokes and in a manner which impressively marks the contrast. This is followed by the divine installation of the king and the promise attached to it (third strophe), to which the psalm adds a warning directed to the rulers of the earth to humble themselves before the divine Lord of earth lest his wrath destroy them (fourth strophe).'<sup>1</sup>

Psalm ii as a whole is 'the king's first proclamation to his subjects, and it is the king himself who speaks'.<sup>2</sup> The descriptions in 1 Kgs i. 33ff. and 2 Kgs xi show that there were two scenes in the ritual of the enthronement festival, in which the king played the central role, namely in his anointing in the temple and in his installation in the royal palace. With MOWINCKEL we believe that Ps ii reflects the latter scene in the palace,<sup>3</sup> where the newly anointed was brought to in solemn procession. 'There the king took his seat on the throne, which symbolized the mountain of the world, and thus assumed his place "at Yahweh's right hand" (ps. 110.1).'<sup>4</sup>

---

1 A. WEISER, *Psalms*, p. 109/110.

2 S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 64/65; cf. A. WEISER, *ibid.*, p. 109.

3 Cf. *Psalms I*, p. 64.

4 *He That Cometh*, p. 64.

In order to understand the second scene clearly, we quote here Ps cx. 1-7, the Hebrew text of which, however, 'is unusually corrupt and the interpretation of many details extremely difficult'<sup>1</sup>:

- (1-2)       The Lord says to my lord,  
              "Sit at my right hand,  
                  till I make your enemies your footstool."  
The Lord sends forth from Zion your mighty scepter.  
              Rule in the midst of your foes;
- (3)       Your people will offer themselves freely  
              on the day you lead your host  
              upon the holy mountains.  
From the womb of the morning  
              like dew your youth will come to you.
- (4)       The Lord has sworn  
              and will not change his mind,  
              "You are a priest for ever  
              after the order of Melchizedek."
- (5-7)       The Lord is at your right hand;  
              he will shatter the kings on the day of his wrath.  
He will execute judgment among the nations,  
              filling them with corpses;  
he will shatter chiefs  
              over the wide earth.  
He will drink from the brook by the way;  
              therefore he will lift up his head.

The exact 'place in life' of this cult psalm is - according to MOWINCKEL<sup>2</sup> - the moment when the king ascends the throne, and it is recited - and probably also composed - by the temple prophet. In accordance with the fact that 'the king's throne was in the East looked upon as a symbol of the throne of the deity'<sup>3</sup>, the theme of Ps cx is 'divine kingship'. Recalling the foreign origin of this concept, it is not surprising that this psalm contains allusions to foreign parallels. First of all: 'The union of royal and priestly power was the main

---

1 OAB, ad loc; cf. G. COOKE, art cit., pp. 218ff.

2 Cf. Psalms I, p. 63/64.

3 *ibid.*, p. 63.



characteristic of El Elyon's kings in ancient Jerusalem, whose realm David and Solomon had inherited and maintained as the foundation of their position of power.<sup>1</sup> This point is extremely important for the understanding of both the Old and the New Testament, for there is a general tendency to overlook the 'religious' aspect of the former's and the 'political' aspect of the latter's concept of 'kingship'. Yahweh ruled the whole life of his people through his anointed, this was the original idea which most probably - in spite of the fact that in the Second Temple the High Priest replaced the king in the cult - never was quite forgotten. Verse 3 is a real crux interpretum. A. WEISER, on the one hand, chooses the reading 'in holy array' instead of 'upon the holy mountains', and comments as follows: 'In a magnificent word-picture, borrowed from myth, of the dew that abundantly flows from the womb of the dawn and refreshes nature in the early morning, the psalm speaks of the young men in the army who in holy warlike array are at once at the disposal of the king, ready in their vigorous and youthful strength and numerically as abundant as the drops of dew in the morning.'<sup>2</sup>

S. MOWINCKEL, on the other hand, finds in vs. 3 the reference to 'the holy robe in which the king has been arrayed for the anointing', and interprets the second half of this verse consequently also in view of the king: 'By the eternal "youthful force" which the king - like the Canaanite fertility god Tal, "Dew" - in that day receives from Yahweh, he shall "strike through" all his enemies.'<sup>3</sup> We believe that this explanation is more in keeping with the cultic situation, for the idea, then, would be that in time of need, i.e. war in this text, the divine power the king was already endowed with in the act of anointing will be renewed and strengthened.

Finally, in vs. 7 there may be an allusion to the holy spring of Gihon, where in Canaanite times the king - probably - was anointed, and the expression 'he will drink from

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 64.

2 A. WEISER, *Psalms I*, p. 64.

3 S. MOWINCKEL, *ibid.*, p. 64; G. COOKE, *art. cit.*, p. 222, translates: 'In holy array from the womb of the dawn go forth; as the dew I have begotten you.' - 'The king', he says, 'is "begotten" or "brought forth", by God; he becomes God's son, receiving thereby the special status and powers of one in close relationship to God and in the capacity of standing for or representing the people before God. So blessed, the king is commanded to go forth at daybreak as one "begotten" like the dew which appears with the morning or proceeds "from the womb of the morning." The king is to be to his people a source of strength and blessing like that of the refreshing dew or rain which is given by God.' (*ibid.*, p. 223/24)

the brook by the way' would point, then, to a rite of purification.<sup>1</sup> The second half of this verse indicates that by drinking the king gets at the same time new strength: 'therefore he will lift up his head'.<sup>2</sup>

The most important feature of Ps cx is that this cult psalm - in spite of its 'place in life' - is throughout theocentric in character: 'Yahweh says ...' (vs. 1), 'Yahweh sends forth...' (vs 2), 'Yahweh has sworn ...' (vs. 4) and again 'Yahweh is at your right hand;...' (vs. 5). At the enthronement in the royal palace, the king sits on the divine throne at the right hand of Yahweh, and wheresoever the anointed exercises his kingship, Yahweh is beside him. This is to say - according to Ps cx - the anointed does not take the place of Yahweh, his 'divinity' is not a matter of 'identity' but of 'extension'. We have to keep this in mind when we turn now our attention again to Ps ii.

Presumably, the king addressed his subjects in the words of Ps ii while seated on the divine throne, for he is obviously speaking as world-ruler. A. WEISER comments on this aspect as follows: 'The world-wide setting into which the psalmist projects the modest proportions of the Israelite kingship can ... hardly be accounted for in any other way than by assuming that he copied a foreign pattern; ...'<sup>3</sup> A dependence on a foreign pattern is, of course, unmistakable. Nevertheless WEISER's explanation is not in keeping with the character of this psalm, for it is historical. The point is, the king is not speaking in his own 'name' but in the 'name' of Yahweh. We must recall here the fact, that the 'myth of creation' is the fundamental myth of the enthronement festival<sup>4</sup>, and consequently also the background to the universalism of Ps ii.

S. MOWINCKEL translates vs. 6 as follows:

for I have (now) been set as His king  
upon Zion, His holy hill.

The RSV, on the other hand, regards the verses 4-6 as a stanza in which Yahweh is the subject - with A. WEISER, who gives it the title 'the Heavenly King' - , and therefore holds its last two lines to be spoken by the deity. Whatever the right translation, the issue now is clear:

---

1 So S. MOWINCKEL, He That Cometh, p. 64.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, and A. WEISER, Psalms, p. 697, who seems to compare this ritual with the 'Lord's supper': '... the king drinks from the sacred fountain in order to get new strength by means of the "partaking of the sacrament" for the war against the nations which he has to wage as Yahweh's chosen one.'

3 *ibid.*, p. 110.

4 See above p. 96.



Either the way the king is speaking is 'the expression of an arrogant presumption'<sup>1</sup>, or he must be able to legitimize himself. He does this in the words of the third stanza of Ps ii, and that by pointing back to the scene in the temple: 'I tell you of the decree (hoq) of the Lord:' ... This scene is also described in 2 Kgs xi. 12:

'Then he brought out the king's son, and put the crown upon him, and gave him the testimony (ha 'edhuth); and they proclaimed him king, and anointed him; and they clapped their hands, and said, "Long live the king!'

This divine decree or testimony seems to be similar to the so-called 'royal protocol' known from the royal ritual in Egypt.<sup>2</sup> Yet whereas the pattern is the same, the content is not. 'The idea of divine sonship', A. WEISER says, 'points to the deification of the king in consequence of which the king was regarded as having been begotten by the deity. It is understandable that the Old Testament rejected the idea of physical divine sonship of the king as incompatible with its spiritual notion of God. In fact, the psalmist, too, excludes the idea of a physical begetting by adding the word "today" and by using the ancient formula of adoption "you are my son", though he leaves untouched the formula "I have begotten you" which originated in that foreign world of ideas. He transforms that alien idea into the idea of adoption, that is to say, into the declaration of the sonship of the king that took place on the day of his enthronement.'<sup>3</sup>

It is worth noting that S. MOWINCKEL calls the decree of Yahweh 'initiation oracle'.<sup>4</sup> Thus we may say, the anointed is the son of Yahweh by initiation. The idea is then that the king 'enters into' a filial relationship with God. In this connection we may quote Ps lxxxix. 19-28, which gives a most clear picture of the nature of filial relationship between Yahweh and his anointed. The 'place in life' of this psalm, moreover, is likely to be the enthronement festival, 'when the accession to the throne of both the heavenly king and the earthly king were celebrated together'.<sup>5</sup>

1 Cf. A. WEISER, *Psalms*, p. 111.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 113; S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 62, and G. VON RAD, *Old Testament Theology*, Vol. 1, *The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions (ET)*, Edinburgh/London 1962, p. 40: 'In the ancient Egyptian theology of the kingship a special part is played by the so-called royal protocol, a document listing the king's throne-name, attesting his divine sonship, his commission as ruler, the promise that his dominion would endure for ever, etc.: this document, allegedly written by the deity himself, was handed to the king at his accession.'

3 *ibid.*, p. 113; cf. also G. COOKE, *art. cit.* p. 110/111.

4 S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 65.

5 Cf. A. WEISER, *ibid.*, p. 591; the author calls this festival 'Covenant Festival'.



- (19) Of old thou didst speak in a vision  
to thy faithful one and say:  
"I have set the crown upon one who is mighty,  
I have exalted one chosen from the people.
- (20-21) I have found David, my servant;  
with my holy oil I have anointed him;  
so that my hand shall ever abide with him,  
my arm also shall strengthen him.
- (22-23) The enemy shall not outwit him,  
the wicked shall not humble him.  
I will crush his foes before him  
and strike down those who hate him.
- (24-25) My faithfulness and my steadfast love shall be with him,  
and in my name shall his horn be exalted.  
I will set his hand on the sea  
and his right hand on the rivers.
- (26-28) He shall cry to me, "Thou art my Father (<sup>ʿ</sup>abhi <sup>ʿ</sup>atah),  
my God and the Rock of my salvation.'  
And I will make him the first-born (<sup>b</sup><sup>e</sup> khor),  
the highest of the kings of the earth.  
My steadfast love I will keep for him for ever,  
and my covenant (<sup>b</sup><sup>e</sup> riti) will stand firm for him. ..."

The last line of this text points to the aspect of divine kingship which is peculiar to the Israelite concept, viz. the 'covenant'. MOWINCKEL says about this aspect: 'The historical core here is that Yahweh's covenant with the king and his "decree" at the anointing was expressly understood to be a renewal of "the favours promised faithfully to David" and of the covenant with him.'<sup>1</sup> The same idea is found in Ps lxxxix.3: "I have made a covenant with my chosen one, I have sworn to David my servant ...". Corresponding to the Hittite conception of kingship, we may say that the term 'servant' especially points to the role of the

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 63.

king as a representative of the people before God.<sup>1</sup> This would imply, then, that in ancient Israel the renewal of the covenant with the king was at the same time the renewal of the covenant with the people. Or, as MOWINCKEL puts it, 'the "covenant" and the "crown" constitute Yahweh's gifts to his adopted royal son.'<sup>2</sup>

In the text of Ps lxxxix, i.e. in the vss. 26-28, we find a clear expression of the sonship of the king as understood in Israel, with which we may compare 2 Sam vii. 14,15:

"I will be his father, and he shall be my son. When he commits iniquity,  
I will chasten him with the rod of men, with the stripes of the son of man;  
but I will not take my steadfast love from him as I took it from Saul, whom  
I put away from before you."

In this connection, S. MOWINCKEL says, 'In Pss. 2 and 110 and in allusions in Ps. 89, 20ff. such enthronement oracles have come down to us, and it is the style and content of such anointment oracles that furnish the material which the tradition used when, in the legend of Nathan, it makes Nathan pronounce such promises to David.'<sup>3</sup>

Furthermore, we may quote MOWINCKEL's view about the cultic function of the king in ancient Israel, i.e. of the 'son of God', which may be important for Jesus' understanding of sonship: 'Though Yahweh's representative towards the people, he is even more the representative of the people towards Yahweh. Figuratively speaking he is the channel through which the blessing of the deity flow to the people. ... In his person the people approaches God, and through him God speaks to the people. Thus he is also a priest and has prophetic gifts. - Thus it is in the cult that the king's part as a mediator and his divine qualities and near relation to the deity and his position as the incorporating representative of the people, are most obvious.'<sup>4</sup>

---

1 See above, p. 112; cf. also J. MORGENSTERN, The Suffering Servant - a new solution, in: VT, Vol XI, Leiden 1961, pp. 292ff.; 406ff. MORGENSTERN's thesis is 'that the Servant is a royal figure, one of the Davidic line, in other words a king of Israel.' (ibid., p. 409).

2 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 62.

3 ibid., p. 63; see however G. COOKE, art. cit., p. 203.

4 ibid., p. 60; cf. also ibid., p. 61: 'The king has direct access to Yahweh and arranges the details of the service himself. He holds, at least theoretically, the same position in the cult as the high priest held later.' See also R. DE VAUX, Ancient Israel, p. 357: '7. The priest as mediator'.

To sum up the present section: We have tried to understand the original meaning of the royal epithet 'son of God' in the cult psalms and saw that the emphasis is on the mediatorial function of the earthly king in ancient Israel. The 'anointed' enters into filial relationship with Yahweh on the day of his enthronement (cf. 'today', Ps ii. 7), and his sonship signifies that he is commissioned to rule in the 'name' of God. This is to say - if we may understand Ps ii. 7 from the concept of 'corporate personality' - ; the earthly king is the 'extension' of the deity, or, Yahweh 'in Person'. As Israel did not know a legal practice of adoption,<sup>1</sup> we believe that the *nephesh*-concept is more appropriate to clarify the original meaning of sonship than an 'adoptional' interpretation. Although the cultic concept of sonship is of non-Israelite origin, it seems that Israel eliminated its mythological and metaphysical connotations, like 'incarnation' connected - sometimes - with 'divine marriage' (Egypt), and 'deification' at death (Hittite king). Israel retained, however, the universal aspect of divine kingship (cf. Pss ii, cx), which is based on the myth of creation.

In short: the royal 'son of God' essentially is the mediator through whom Yahweh blesses and rules His people. This, of course, was the ideal which was put into practice by the kings in question only to the extent of their trust and obedience to the heavenly king. The final criterion, however, is the favour and faithfulness of Yahweh (cf. Ps lxxxix).

We note, finally, that in Ps ci, which 'may have been used as a part of a coronation ceremony',<sup>2</sup> perhaps in view of the renewal of the covenant through the king as the representative of the people, 'perfection' is mentioned as a royal ideal and, in a similar way, in Ps lxxviii. 72. This leads us to our next chapter, which tries to answer the question, What is the 'place in life' and the meaning of 'perfection' in the Old Testament?

---

1 Cf. G. COOKE, art. cit., pp. 215/16; COOKE's conclusion is: 'In view of the present writer the term "adoption" should not be taken too seriously in discussing this problem. Even though the OT evidence for adoption in the strict sense is extremely meager (COOKE mentions Ruth iv. 16; Ps xxvii. 10; Num xi. 12), the passages cited in the preceding paragraphs suggest that a relationship was known to the Hebrews which was for all practical purposes concerning the parties involved an adoptive relationship.'

2 OAB, ad. loc.



At the end of the present chapter about the presupposition of the Sermon on the Mount it is, of course, not our intention to sum up its content. We have tried to follow the structure of the ancient temple cult in connection with the enthronement both of Yahweh and of the earthly king, as far as this structure is evident from the psalms. Our assumption is that the psalms discussed in this chapter may be a 'main-source' of Jesus' teaching on the Mount.

As to the second 'source' of the Sermon, namely, the temple cult as Jesus experienced it himself, we have mentioned already that in Jesus' time the original Enthronement Festival, or, the Feast of Tabernacles, was divided into three separate yet closely linked festivals.<sup>1</sup> It is necessary to recall here briefly the main features of the contemporary festivals, because it is likely that these features are reflected in the Sermon as well.

(1) The 1st Tishri was the day of the New Year Feast (rosh hashshannah, cf. Ez xl. 1),<sup>2</sup> i.e. of the 'feast of the kingdom of God',<sup>3</sup> the main feature of which is the 'blowing of the trumpets' (cf. Num x.10). A. EDERSHEIM says, 'It was, so to speak, the host of God assembled, waiting for their leader; the people of God united to proclaim their King. At the blast of the priest's trumpets they ranged themselves, as it were, under His banner and before His throne, and this symbolical confession and proclamation of Him as "Jehovah their God", brought them before Him to be "remembered" and "saved".'<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Cf. S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 120. The reason why we hold that the psalms are the main or primary source is that the concept of 'sonship' is present in the psalms and in the Sermon, but 'played down' in contemporary Judaism and apparently missing in the contemporary temple cult.

2 Cf. R. DE VAUX, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 502ff., esp. *ibid.*, p. 502: 'Under this name, and with these rites, the feast never existed in Old Testament times.'

3 A. GUILDING, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

4 A. EDERSHEIM, *Temple*, p. 290; see however A. GUILDING, *op. cit.*, p. 86: 'at the New Year God is both Judge and King.' Its prominent themes were, therefore, (a) The Theme of Judgment. (b) The theme of the vision of God. (*ibid.*, p. 77/78).

A. GUILDING mentions Joel ii. 1 among the lectionary readings for New Year:<sup>1</sup>

Blow the trumpet in Zion;

sound the alarm on my holy mountain:

Let all the inhabitants of the land tremble,

for the day of the Lord is coming, it is near, ...

(2) The 10th Tishri is the Day of Atonement (yom hakkippurim), or 'the day' (cf. Hb vii. 27), 'the feast' (Acts xxvii. 9). Every year on this day the high priest in a simple white dress entered behind the veil into the Holy of Holies, incensed the mercy-seat (kapporeth) and sprinkled it with some blood of the bull presented as a sin offering for himself (cf. Lev xvi. 11-14).

A. EDERSHEIM says, referring to the Feast of Tabernacles, '... before that grand festival of harvesting and thanksgiving Israel must, as a nation, be reconciled unto God for only a people at peace with God might rejoice before Him in the blessing with which He had crowned the year. And the import of the Day of Atonement, as preceding the Feast of Tabernacles, becomes only more striking, when we remember how that feast of harvesting prefigured the final in-gathering of all nations. In connection with this point it may also be well to remember that the Jubilee Year was always proclaimed on the Day of Atonement.'<sup>2</sup>

(3) From Tishri 15th to 21st the Feast of Tabernacles (sukkoth) was celebrated. This was the feast par excellence (cf. Ez xlv. 25; 1 Kg viii. 2, 65), which was marked especially by three things, namely: 'its joyous festivities, the dwelling in "booths", and the peculiar sacrifices and rites of the week.'<sup>3</sup>

(a) The first characteristic is referred to in Dt xvi. 13-17: For seven days Israel is to keep the feast 'because the Lord your God will bless you in all your produce and in all the work of your hands, so that you will be altogether joyful.' Israel 'shall not appear before the Lord empty-handed': 'Votive, freewill, and peace-offerings would mark their gratitude to God, and at the meal which ensued the poor, the stranger, the Levite, and the homeless would be welcome

---

1 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 77.

2 A. EDERSHEIM, *ibid.*, p. 304/05.

3 *ibid.*, p. 272; cf. also A. GUILDING, *ibid.*, p. 93: 'The key-notes of the festival, then, are the water-pouring, the illumination, the dwelling in a booth and the harvesting of the vine.'

guests, for the Lord's sake.<sup>1</sup>

(b) As to the second feature, EDERSHEIM says, 'the harvest-thanksgiving of the Feast of Tabernacles reminded Israel, on the one hand, of their dwelling in the booths in the wilderness, while, on the other hand, it pointed to the final harvest when Israel's mission should be completed, and all nations gathered unto the Lord,'<sup>2</sup> (cf. Is xxv. 6-8; Zech xiv. 16). As a visible sign to remind Israel of her journey, the worshippers carried the 'fruit of goodly trees', i.e. a citron, 'branches of palm trees, and boughs of leafy trees, and willows of the brook' (cf. Lev xxiii. 40) in procession. This procession was formed on every day and the priests led it around the altar, singing Ps cxviii. 25. 'But on the seventh,' EDERSHEIM says, ' "the great day of the feast" they made the circuit of the altar seven times, remembering how the walls of Jericho had fallen in similar circumstances, and anticipating how, by the direct interposition of God, the walls of heathenism would fall before *Jehova*, and the land lie open before His people to go in and possess it.'<sup>3</sup> On this special occasion, Ps cxviii. 26-29 was chanted, 'and the palm branches beaten in pieces by the side of the altar.'<sup>4</sup> (cf. Mt xxi. 8, 9)

(c) The third feature is, first, the peculiar offerings, the number of which is always divisible by the sacred number seven.<sup>5</sup> According to the Talmud, 'these sacrifices were offered, not for Israel, but for the nations of the world: "There were seventy bullocks, to correspond to the number of the seventy nations of the world."<sup>6</sup> Second, the rituals which dominated this feast were the pouring out of water and the illumination of the Temple.<sup>7</sup>

---

1 A. EDERSHEIM, *Temple*, p. 272.

2 *ibid.*, p. 269.

3 *ibid.*, p. 280.

4 *ibid.*, p. 281.

5 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 276.

6 *ibid.*, p. 277.

7 So *ibid.*, p. 286; A. GUILDING, *op. cit.*, p. 119; cf. GUILDING, *ibid.*, p. 119: 'The water-pouring signifies the gift of the Spirit, the gift of life: the illuminations signify the spiritual enlightenment that accompanies baptism, the gift of light. The word came early to be used for baptism, and already in the Epistle to the Hebrews φωτισθηναί (to be enlightened) seems to be a synonym for βαπτισθηναί (to be baptized).'



The second rite, we believe, is the background against which Mt v. 14 may be understood. For this occasion, four golden candlesticks were lit in the court of the women, and 'the "Chassadim" and "the men of Deed" danced before the people with flaming torches in their hands.'<sup>1</sup> 'It seems clear', EDERSHEIM says, 'that this illumination of the Temple was regarded as forming part of, and having the same symbolic meaning as, "the pouring out of water". The light shining out of the Temple into the darkness around, and lighting up every court in Jerusalem, must have been intended as a symbol not only of the Shechinah which once filled the Temple, but of that "great light" which "the people that walked in darkness" were to see, and which was to shine "upon them that dwell in the land of the shadow of death".'<sup>2</sup> (Cf. Is ix. 2)

---

1 A. EDERSHEIM, *ibid.*, p. 283.

2 *ibid.*, p. 285. In this context, EDERSHEIM himself refers to Jn viii. 12. - On this ritual see also *ibid.*, pp. 333ff., concerning the Feast of the Dedication of the Temple (hanukkah), which was instituted by Judas Maccabaeus in 164 B.C., and bears striking resemblance to the Feast of Tabernacles. A common feature is, e.g., the Temple illumination. 'The Feast of Lights' thus commemorates the restoration of the Temple, and perhaps refers to the heavenly fire mentioned in 2 Chr vii. 1 (HERZFELD).

2 Cf. also WALTHER EICHRODT, *Theology of the Old Testament*, Vol. I (ET), London 1961, p. 122/23: 'In all probability, however, this feast of tents is also an ancient New Year festival, celebrating the advent of Yahweh in the midst of his people, and the blessing on the new year which men looked to him to provide. Although admittedly the evidence for them is late, the nocturnal ceremony of the feast of lights and the ceremonial pouring of water are surely of extreme antiquity, and suggest ancient fertility rites aimed at securing the prayed-for renewal of the forces of Nature.'

#### IV

### THE 'PLACE IN LIFE' AND THE MEANING OF PERFECTION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Although in this chapter we shall try to show that the concept of perfection in the context of the Sermon on the Mount shares in the same presupposition as the three concepts discussed in the previous chapter, there is a good reason for beginning a new chapter here. For the intimate relationship between the Sermon as a whole and 'perfection' is implied in our hypothesis and thus must be established and not be taken for granted. We are concerned here, then, to clarify the 'place in life' of 'perfection' (Heb. noun = *tom*, *tam*; adj. = *tamim*) and its meaning in the Old Testament. Strictly speaking a concept cannot, of course, have a 'place in life' but only a saying, a psalm, etc., the 'form' of which suggests its use in a specific part of the temple cult. Hence, when we shall speak of the 'place in life' of *tamim* in this chapter, this must be understood in the sense of *tamim*, 'together with its context'.

It is well known that the saying Mt v. 48 - which is the immediate context of 'perfection' in the Sermon on the Mount - is modelled on Lev xix. 2: "Say to all the congregation of the people of Israel,

You shall be holy (*q<sup>e</sup>dhoshim*);

for I the Lord your God am holy (*qadhosh*)."

However, the author of Mt v. 48 replaced the terms *qadhosh* // ὁ ἅγιος by *tamim* // τέλειος, which stems most probably from Dt xviii. 13:

"You shall be *tamim* ... im the Lord your God."

The latter saying, by the way, is one of the few instances where the Septuagint renders *tamim* by τέλειος.<sup>1</sup> We must presume that the Hebrew version of the Old Testament is

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. TRILLING, op. cit., p. 167; C. EDLUND, op. cit., p. 49.

decisive, if we are concerned with the Old Testament as the background to the teaching of the historical Jesus.

The observed replacement of terms is the more astonishing because Lev. xix. 2 is quoted in the First Letter of Peter, i. 16; in a short version which retains the original terms: '... since it is written,

"You shall be holy ( ἁγιοι ),  
for I am holy ( ἁγιος )."<sup>1</sup>

These well-known facts<sup>2</sup> imply, as a matter of method, that we may not discuss tamim as an isolated concept but rather as a concept related to qadhosh, in order to understand the concept of 'perfection' contained in Mt v. 48.

---

1 Cf. also Lev xi. 44, xx. 7.

2 They are all mentioned in the marginal notes of the NESTLE Greek text, ad Mt v. 48 and 1 Pet i. 16.



# 1 The origin of the term tamim and its relation to qadhosh

(1) A most important observation about the origin of the Old Testament term tamim is contained in the following statement by WALTHER EICHRODT: 'tamim, "entire", "intact", may stem from sacrificial terminology, where it denotes the faultless condition of the sacrificial animal; transferred to the ethical and religious behaviour of man, it means a way of life agreeable to God, which in turn receives its concrete specification only from the existing communion-relationship with God. The contrast to a damage or injury of the original value inherent in the term seems to refer in the first place to the undivided devotion of the heart,<sup>1</sup> as the use of the noun tom for simplicity and innocence suggests.<sup>2</sup>

A similar view is expressed by R. BULTMANN, when he says at the outset of a section about 'Good and Evil' in the Old Testament Heritage: 'The judgments passed on man and his activity are not derived from an ideal conception of man or the Good. The ethical vocabulary of the Old Testament is not derived, as with the Greeks, from the plastic arts or craftsmanship. It comes partly from the law court and commerce, partly from the cultus. Hence there are no such laudatory epithets as "becoming", "decent", "harmonious", "well-proportioned", "graceful" and the like (εὐσχημων, κόσμιος, εὐάρμοστος, ἔμμετρος, εὐρύθμος, etc.). Instead, we get such terms as "true", "faithful", or (from the cultus) "whole", "without blemish", "unspotted".<sup>3</sup> BULTMANN concludes the same section with the following sentence: The old condition laid down for the sacrificial victim, viz., that it should be entire and without blemish, is reapplied to the worshipper himself.<sup>4</sup>

1 At this point EICHRODT refers to Dt xviii. 13.

2 W. EICHRODT, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Vol. III (3rd ed., bound together with Vol. II, not yet trans. into E.), Berlin 1950, p. 90.

3 R. BULTMAN, *Primitive Christianity In Its Contemporary Setting* (ET), London 1956, P. 48: cf. the added n. 36: 'This concept of wholeness is rendered by the Greek τέλειος at Matt. 5.48. Hence it does not mean "perfect", in the Greek sense of the highest stage of a development. ...' (ibid., p. 212).

4 ibid., p. 51; the ref. is to Ps li.10, where the MT has lebh tahor (vs 12).

Sacrificial terminology, of course, is not the ultimate origin of the term *tamim*.

C. EDLUND is right in saying, 'To a certain extent *tamim* may be called a *terminus technicus*', namely, of the cult.<sup>1</sup> This most probably is the background against which we must understand the ethical or religious term *tamim*. The meaning of the technical term is fully described in Lev xxii. 17-25. It is, in short: the (male) sacrificial animal 'to be accepted must be "sound" (*tamim*); there shall be no "blemish from disease" (*mum*) in it.' (vs. 21b) In addition to being "sound" in this sense, the animal must be "whole" in the sense of "fully and normally developed" as well: 'A bull or a lamb which has a part too long or too short you may present for a freewill offering; but for a votive offering it cannot be accepted.' (vs. 23)

It is worth noting, furthermore, that the same condition (to be *tamim*) according to Ex xii. 5 applies also for the passover-lamb: 'Your lamb shall be without blemish (*tamim*), a male a year old; you shall take it from the sheep or from the goats;'.<sup>2</sup>

The reason why the condition laid down for the sacrificial animals came to be reapplied to the worshippers is perhaps to be sought in the ritual of 'the laying on of hands', through which 'the worshipper symbolically identifies himself with his sacrifice'.<sup>2</sup> For the transition of the term from the one to the other we may compare the following two texts, the parallels of which are too striking to be merely incidental: 'If his offering is a burnt offering from the herd, he shall offer a male without blemish (*tamim*); he shall offer it at the door of the tent (<sup>2</sup>*ohel*) of meeting, that he may be accepted before the Lord; he shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt offering, and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement (<sup>e</sup>*khapper*) for him.' (Lev i. 3,4)

O Lord, who shall sojourn in thy tent (<sup>2</sup>*ohel*)?

Who shall dwell on the holy hill?

He who walks blamelessly (*tamim*) ... (Ps xv. 1-2a)

In both cases, the vital issue is the same, namely, condition(s) of acceptance before

1 C. EDLUND, op. cit., p. 29; *ibid.*, pp. 28/29, EDLUND discusses the secular meaning of the root *tmm* in the OT.

2 OAB, ad Lev i. 4 (cf. Ex xxix. 10, n). See however TH. C. VRIEZEN, *An Outline of Old Testament Theology* (ET), Oxford 1958, p. 288: 'The sacrificer is active in so far as he brings the offering with him and, by laying his hands on the animal (*semikhah*) gives evidence of his intention to sacrifice it.' Another reason may be found in Lev xxi. 16-23: 'Just as the sacrificial offering must be unblemished (22.17-25), so the priest who offers it must be without bodily defect.' (OAB, n. ad loc.)

the Lord. The one who seeks acceptance in fact is also the same, namely the worshipper who identifies himself with his offering, which is to 'make atonement (l<sup>e</sup> khapper) for him',<sup>1</sup> and thus renews his relation with Yahweh.<sup>2</sup>

We may conclude, then, that when tamim is reapplied to the worshipper himself, the emphasis is on relationship with the Deity. This is to say, the worshipper is not 'whole' in accordance with some ideal of a 'perfect man', but his relation to Yahweh is 'whole', 'entire', 'intact', 'sound'. This links up with the linguistic fact mentioned by G. VON RAD, namely, that 'perfection' (tom) belongs to a group of terms denoting relationship, such as 'righteousness' (qedheq), 'rectitude' (yosher), 'loyalty' (hesedh).<sup>3</sup>

(2) As to the relation of tamim to qadhosh, we may begin with a suggestion made by O. R. JONES, namely, that 'wholeness' is just another aspect of 'holiness'. 'The word "whole" or "wholeness", he argues, 'in virtue of its etymological affinity with the word "holiness" deserves to be considered as a possible logical kinsman of the latter. It seems to me that "wholeness" understood in a special sense, could be used as a substitute for "holiness" in many contexts, and in the present chapter I shall try to substantiate that claim. ... We shall see in due course that "holiness" is also closely associated with "health" in the Old Testament as well as the New Testament.'<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Cf. TH. C. VRIEZEN, *Theology* (op. cit.), p. 287, n.1: 'The original meaning of "kipper" in the O.T. is probably, like the Akkadian "kuppuru", "to smooth", "to smooth out", "to spread", and not (as Kohler argues from the Arabic) "to cover"; ... It is connected with a pre-Israelite conception (still active in Israel!) of sin as a stain, a taint, which endangers the well-being of the individual and the community. That sin is a stain which is wiped off by the "kipper"-act also appears clearly from the prescriptions given in Lev. v.1 with respect to the "sins" that make a sin-offering imperative; from the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi), which purify temple and altar as well as the high priest and the people (Lev. xvi. 19f.); ...'

2 Cf. the ref. by VRIEZEN, *ibid.*, p. 286, n. 3, to H. WHEELER ROBINSON, *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*, Oxford 1946, p. 227: 'The sacrificial act is in miniature the actual renewal of a relation. In the fundamental conception of sacrifice as a gift, seen in the whole burnt-offering, acceptance of it restores some previous relation which has been broken, or reinforces one which exists. ...'

3 Cf. G. VON RAD, *Theology I* (op. cit.), p. 372.

4 O. R. JONES, *The Concept of Holiness*, London 1961, p. 89.



JONES' suggestion is very interesting in view of our special problem, for it would imply that in Mt v. 48 we have to do not with an actual replacing of one term by another, but rather with an emphasis on another aspect of 'holiness' brought out by rendering qadhosh by  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$  instead of  $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ . But however it may be with the observed etymological affinity in English,<sup>1</sup> JONES seems to overlook the fact that in Hebrew the conception of 'holiness' is expressed by the root qdsh and its derivatives, whilst for 'wholeness' the root tmm and its derivatives is used.<sup>2</sup>

According to OTTO PROCKSCH, the root qdsh is perhaps of Canaanite origin. Its nearest 'kinsman' is thr and its derivatives, and the basic difference between the two roots is that qdsh is a 'fundamental cultic term', whereas thr is a 'ritual term'.<sup>3</sup> 'From the beginning', PROCKSCH says, 'qdsh has a close relationship to the cultic sphere. What stands in a positive relation to the cult, God, man, thing, space, time, can be included in the concept of qdsh'.<sup>4</sup>

Hence we may conclude that qadhosh and tamim are similar in that both are 'cultic' and 'relational' concepts. However, the development of the term qadhosh within the Old Testament, and even more so until the stage of Rabbinic Judaism, affected this fundamental meaning. Instead of the positive meaning, namely that of 'belonging to God',<sup>5</sup> the negative aspect of 'separation' (from idolatry, from sin, from unchastity, from the Gentiles, etc.) has become more and more prominent.<sup>6</sup>

The main reason for this development is the special use of the term 'holy' to describe the character or nature of God Himself, together with the 'unique understanding of the divine

1 JONES, *ibid.*, p. 89, refers to the word 'hailo' from which the word 'holy' derives', of which the Oxford English Dictionary says that 'it is with some probability assumed to have been "inviolable, inviolable, that must be preserved whole or intact, that cannot be injured with impunity".'

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 101, the ref. to the quality of the 'sacrificial animal', without mentioning tamim.

3 O. PROCKSCH, art.  $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , in: *TWNT I*, p. 88.

4 *ibid.*, p. 89.

5 Cf. W. EICHRODT, *Theology I (ET)*, p. 137; for the primary meaning, EICHRODT points to Num xvi. 5: 'In the morning will Yahweh make known who is his, and (therefore) is holy.' The priests are here called holy, because they stand in an especially close relationship to God.' (*ibid.*, p. 137, n. 3)

6 Cf. K. G. KUHN, art.  $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , in: *TWNT I*, p. 101 (in Rabbinic Judaism).

being as the wholly other, the fearful and exalted'.<sup>1</sup> It is worth noting that at the stage when this understanding was reached, the concept of 'kābōd' - which originally 'denoted the phenomenon of dazzling heavenly fire which accompanied a theophany' (cf. Ex xxiv. 16f) - came to be associated with 'qōdeš, the unapproachable divine nature.' 'Sometimes', EICHRODT says, 'kābōd was conceived as an earthly image reflecting the qōdeš; sometimes it is the actual brilliance and glory from that other world, the heavenly robe of light in which holiness is clothed, which, though fatal to mortal eyes, must with the triumph of the divine kingdom fill the whole earth. In either case kabod is a cosmic attribute of deity which is morally neutral.'

However, the designation of Israel as a 'holy nation' (cf. Ex xix. 6; Dt vii. 6, xiv. 2) now took on a moral connotation. 'In the so-called Holiness Code (Lev. 17-26) the divine holiness as defined in purely religious terms is combined with the idea of spotless purity, which debar and destroys everything impure. The crucial text is Lev. 19.2: "Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy."'<sup>2</sup> EICHRODT explains that this implies 'moral purity and blamelessness'.

In this connection, we may quote also R. MARTIN-ACHARD, who holds the expression 'holy nation' (goi qadsh) in Ex xix. 6 to be almost synonymous with the parallel expression found in that verse, namely, 'kingdom of priests' (mamleketh kohanim), and that together they define Israel's mission: 'In the midst of the nations Israel is like a priest among his people.'<sup>3</sup> To this we may add the following statement by R. DE PURY:<sup>4</sup> 'A priest is one who represents God before men. Israel represents the kingship of God in the world, it is the first-fruits of what every people must become. In this particular way Israel and Israel alone belongs to its God simply in order that one day all the peoples may belong to Him.'

---

1 W. EICHRODT, Theology I, p. 277; all cit. of this par. are from this p.

2 *ibid.*, p. 278; the cit. in the following sentence is also from here.

3 R. MARTIN-ACHARD, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

4 Le Libérateur (2nd ed.) Geneva 1957, p. 63; (cit. from R. MARTIN-ACHARD, *ibid.*, p. 40, n.12)

The peak of the development of the term qadhosh within the Old Testament may be said to have been reached with Isaiah, and that in his designation of Yahweh as 'The holy One of Israel' (q<sup>e</sup>dhosh yisra'el).<sup>1</sup> 'Isaiah', EICHRODT says, 'went even further along these lines, and made the predicate qāḏōš an expression for the moral governance of the world. In the decisive hour of his life, when in the Temple he found himself confronted by his God, he could not but cry out: "Woe is me: for I am undone"; but what overwhelmed him was not the separation from the divine realm which is the common lot of men, but the contradiction between his own sinful nature and that of the Thrice-Holy. The work of cultic expiation wrought upon him gave him the assurance that 'āwōn and ḥattā'at, that is to say, whatever in his personal conduct was an offence against God, was forgiven.'<sup>2</sup> The accent in Isaiah's use of the word qadhosh is 'on the transcendent moral majesty of God', and consequently it 'acquires a primary significance of threatening and punishment.'<sup>3</sup>

This is the background against which the suggested replacing of the term qadhosh by tamim in Mt v. 48 must be understood, together with the above-mentioned connotation of qadhosh in Rabbinic Judaism, namely, 'separation'. Over against the development of the concept of holiness, it seems that the root tm and its derivatives have kept their fundamental character as a cultic and relational concept. As such, we believe, it replaced qdsh in its original meaning already in the temple cult of ancient Israel. However, the two were never quite identical: for whereas the original basic meaning of qadhosh, namely, 'belonging to God', was rather static, the religious concept tamim derived from sacrificial terminology is stronger, almost dynamic in character. This is most obvious in the important saying Dt xviii. 13:

MT = tamim tih<sup>e</sup>yeh 'im YHWH 'elohekha.

In order to bring out both the relationship between qadhosh and tamim and the dynamic character of the latter, we propose the following translation:

You shall be wholly consecrated to Yahweh your God.<sup>4</sup>

1 Cf. Is i.4; v.19, 24; x.20; xii.6; xvii. 7; xxix. 19; xxx.11, 12, 15; xxxvii. 23.

2 W. EICHRODT, *Theology I*, p. 279.

3 *ibid.*, p. 280.

4 Cf. C. EDLUND's trans. of Dt. xviii. 13, *op. cit.*, p. 49: 'du sollst ganz und ungeteilt, ganz-herzig, Jahve, deinem Gott, gehören.' And also M. BUBER, *Two Types of Faith* (ET) London 1951, p. 61: 'Thou shalt be entire (undivided) with JHVH thy God.'



EDLUND is right in saying, "im means "with" and not "before". LXX shows here a moralizing tendency, a first aspiration for diluting a genuine religious term.<sup>1</sup> It seems that the translators of the Revised Standard Version followed the Septuagint, when they rendered Dt xviii. 13 by, 'You shall be blameless before the Lord your God.'<sup>2</sup> The context of this saying, namely Dt. xviii. 9-12, and more especially vs. 10, which 'probably refers to an ordeal of passing through the fire as a test of devotion to Molech, the god of Ammon',<sup>3</sup> confirms our translation, in that we have to do here with devotion of consecration to Yahweh over against pagan gods and practices.

G. VON RAD says in this connection, 'The most concise definition of the demands which Jahweh's zeal laid upon Israel is given in Deuteronomy - Israel is to be "perfect" (tamim) with Jahweh (Deut. xviii. 13).'<sup>4</sup> M. BUBER adds to his translation of the same verse, 'This does not refer to a perfection which emulates the Divine perfection, but to completeness, undividedness, entirety, in the relation to God.'<sup>5</sup>

Our final point in this section is: tamim may not only be described as a cultic and relational but also as a formal term.<sup>6</sup> This implies that it denotes the form of man's relation to God rather than its ethical content. This is - if we understand him correctly - what EICHRODT means, when he says, 'transferred to the ethical and religious behaviour of man, it (sc. tamim) means a way of life agreeable to God, which in turn receives its concrete specification only from the existing communion-relationship with God.'<sup>7</sup>

Of course, it is not our intention to translate every instance of 'tamim' mechanically by 'wholly consecrated'. On the contrary, in the following two sections we shall examine carefully to what extent the meaning of perfection in the Old Testament is influenced by its 'place in life'.

---

1 C. EDLUND, op. cit., p. 49; cf. also EDLUND's criticism of P. J. DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, for not paying enough attention to the moralizing tendency of the LXX, in *TZ*, Jahrg. 16, Heft 5, Sept.-Oct. 1980, p. 416/17.

2 Cf. also the Moffatt Translation: 'Before the Eternal your God you must be blameless.'

3 OAB, ad loc.

4 G. VON RAD, *Theology I*, p. 208.

5 M. BUBER, op. cit., p. 61.

6 Cf. E. PERCY, op. cit., p. 163; and H. LJUNGMAN, op. cit., p. 89.

7 W. EICHRODT, *Theologie III*, p. 90; (cf. the beginning of the present section).

## 2 The first 'place in life' of tamim

The present section links up with our chapter three, section one, entitled 'The concept of initiation'. There we suggested that the Beatitudes may be understood against the background of the 'entrance-liturgies' Pss xv and xxiv. 3-6.<sup>1</sup> The heading of the present section points to S. MOWINCKEL's thesis about the twofold 'place in life' of the 'decalogical tradition' in Israel, namely, (1) in 'the announcement of the conditions of admittance to the sanctuary, and (2) the renewal of the covenant with its conditions.'<sup>2</sup> Our point of departure in this section concerned with the first 'place in life' of tamim is the fact that tamim occurs in Ps xv.2, and that as the first of ten conditions of admission to the sanctuary.

We might assume that our previous discussion of the concept of initiation has made the first 'place in life' sufficiently clear, so that we now can turn our attention immediately to the meaning of tamim in the context of the 'entrance-liturgy' Ps xv. However, this widely accepted view of Ps xv has recently been disputed by J. L. KOOLE.<sup>3</sup> His article is of importance for our present discussion because his arguments against this psalm being an 'entrance-liturgy' used in connection with the entry of the festal processions into the sanctuary culminate in a statement in which the meaning of tamim in this 'place in life' is involved.

We list here KOOLE's main arguments: (a) an actual priestly formula of admittance is missing; (b) 'the expression "dwell on the holy hill" hardly is applicable to a temporary visit to the Temple';<sup>4</sup> (c) Jer vii. 2 speaks against the existence of an 'entrance-liturgy' used regularly; (d) at any rate such a liturgy would be impracticable in view of the large crowds of the festal processions; (e) if Ps xv were used as an 'entrance-liturgy' one would expect it to

---

1 See above pp.79 ff.

2 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 180; cf. also *ibid.*, pp. 179, 180, n. 188, and above p.

3 J. L. KOOLE, Psalm XV - Eine königliche Einzugs-liturgie, in: OTS, Deel XIII, Leiden 1963, pp. 98-111.

4 *ibid.*, p. 99.

contain cultic rather than ethical conditions;<sup>1</sup> and (f) 'We have to realise that near-perfect holiness and blamelessness is required in Ps xv'.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, KOOLE concludes - after considering and rejecting an application to the priesthood<sup>3</sup> - that we are left with a last possibility: Ps xv may be interpreted as belonging to the royal enthronement.<sup>4</sup>

Some of KOOLE's arguments are not very convincing. He says, for example, in connection with the second 'entrance-liturgy' Ps xxiv, 'again we are astonished about the incongruity of inquiry and answer; one did not ask for "blessing and vindication" but for admission to the sanctuary.'<sup>5</sup> 'Blessing', he proceeds, 'is in Ps xxi. 4ff. the essence of all benefits granted by God to the king, by force of which he is transferred to the closest proximity to God and can be addressed as an angel of God and son of God (cf. 2 Sam xiv.20; Ps ii.7).'<sup>6</sup> Of course, the first part of this statement is correct. But on the other hand, 'blessing' points to the very reason why Israel 'went up' in festal processions to the holy place: 'To procure, secure and increase "the blessing", ' MOWINCKEL explains, 'that was the object of the temple services in Israel, put in a nutshell.'<sup>7</sup> Hence it follows that Ps xxiv. 5 is very appropriate in the context of an 'entrance-liturgy'.

Moreover, we may assume that this verse points to the priestly formula of admittance, which is preserved in the context of the royal thanksgiving Ps cxviii:

"Blessed be he who enters in the name of the Lord: "

"We bless you from the house of the Lord." (26)<sup>8</sup>

It is reasonable to think that 26a contains the actual priestly formula, whereas 26b is 'a choral blessing'.<sup>9</sup> On the whole it is quite clear that the temple liturgy in Israel was

---

1 *ibid.*, p. 100.

2 *ibid.*, p. 101.

3 See *ibid.*, pp. 103/04.

4 *ibid.*, p. 104.

5 *ibid.*, p. 105.

6 *ibid.*, p. 105.

7 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms II, p. 46.

8 Cf. above p. 80.

9 Cf. OAB, ad loc.: 'The suppliant is admitted with a choral blessing.'



chanted responsively, and that in turn by the procession, led by its leader, and by the temple choir, led - in the case of the 'entrance-liturgy' - by the priestly 'gate-keeper'.<sup>1</sup> If this is correct, the largeness of the processional crowds would not make the 'entrance-liturgy' impracticable, as KOOLE assumes in argument (d). e/

Furthermore, the evidence of Jer vii. 2ff., "Stand in the gate of the Lord's house, and proclaim there this word, and say, Hear the word of the Lord, all you men of Judah who enter these gates to worship the Lord ...", at least is ambiguous. It could be argued even more convincingly that Jeremiah here is ordered to imitate the activity of the 'gate-keeper' who - perhaps together with the temple choir - proclaims the 'word of entrance' (cf. Jer. vii. 5-6). This seems to be confirmed by the following parallel between Jer vii. 7a and Ps xv. 1b:

then I will let you dwell in this place,  
in the land that I gave of old to your fathers for ever.

O Lord, who shall sojourn in thy tent?  
Who shall dwell on thy holy hill?

A recent article by R. E. CLEMENTS throws new light on the expression of 'dwelling' in the temple, and in fact answers some of the remaining objections by KOOLE which we mentioned above.<sup>2</sup> CLEMENTS suggests that the 'primary reference' of that expression is 'to visits made to the temple to participate in the worship there'.<sup>3</sup> This is quite clear in the case of Ps xv. 1b. The new feature of CLEMENTS' interpretation, however, is this: 'The privilege of worshipping in the temple was believed to carry with it the further privilege of dwelling on Yahweh's land, as one of his "GĒRIM". To dwell, or sojourn, in Yahweh's house at a festival carried with it the benefit and right of dwelling on the land which Yahweh sanctified.'<sup>4</sup> This point supports our conjecture mentioned above, namely, that Jer vii. 2ff. reflects the 'entrance-liturgies'. For in vs. 7a there occurs not only the term 'dwell' (shkn) but also the

---

1 It may be said to be the main-thesis of MOWINCKEL's cultic interpretation of the psalms that they 'were meant to be sung.' In fact, this was a common feature of the cult: 'Hymns belong to the oldest cultic utterance everywhere.' (Psalms I, p. 8; cf. also *ibid.*, p. 177, concerning Ps xxiv).

2 R. E. CLEMENTS, Temple and Land: A Significant Aspect of Israel's Worship, in: Transactions (Glasgow University Oriental Society), Vol. XIX, 1961-62, pp. 16ff.

3 *ibid.*, p. 19.

4 *ibid.*, p. 20.

parallelism (holy) place // land, which indicates that for the 'conditions' proclaimed by Jeremiah, too, both the right to enter the temple and the right to be one of Yahweh's "gerim" was at stake.<sup>1</sup>

CLEMENTS' contention, that 'The meaning of Mount Zion must therefore be understood in the light of the significance of sacred mountains in Canaan and the Ancient Near East',<sup>2</sup> and that in the sense that the temple-mount 'was the "sacred acre" which represented the land before its owner and lord, on the principle of pars pro toto',<sup>3</sup> also points to an answer to KOOLE's objection that the so-called 'entrance-liturgies' contain ethical rather than cultic conditions.<sup>4</sup> The answer is this: as access to the holy mountain symbolized access to and dwelling on Yahweh's land, it is logical that the conditions of admittance refer to the way of life of the worshipper.

This brings us to the vital point of the present section, namely, to the meaning of 'perfection' in the context of the 'Decalogue' Ps xv. 2-5:

- (1) He who walks blamelessly (holek tamim),
- (2) and does what is right (qedheq),
- (3) and speaks truth ('emeth) from his heart;
- (4) who does not slander with his tongue,
- (5) and does no evil to his friend,
- (6) nor takes up a reproach against his neighbor,
- (7) in whose eyes a reprobate is despised,  
but who honors those who fear the Lord;
- (8) who swears to his own hurt  
and does not change;
- (9) who does not put out his money at interest,
- (10) and does not take a bribe against the innocent.

---

1 Cf. R. E. CLEMENTS, art. cit., p. 23 (with ref. to Ps xv.1); and J. L. KOOLE, art. cit., p. 106/07: in 1 Chr xxix. 15 David says, 'we are ... gerim ...'. KOOLE interprets this as an expression of David's dependence for the continuance of his dynasty on God's grace, referring also to Ps cx. 1.

2 *ibid.*, p. 24.

3 *ibid.*, p. 21.

4 Cf. also A. WEISER, *Psalms*, p. 168: 'First of all, it is a striking fact that in a song designed for the cultus (sc. Ps xv) no mention whatsoever is made of cultic matters such as sacrifices, offerings and purity rites, but only of moral requirements.'

A. WEISER's comment on vs. 2, i.e. 'condition' (1)-(3) above, is worth noting: 'By attributing the "perfection" of man's conduct and the "righteousness" of his actions to the inward truthfulness of his convictions (v.2), the psalmist has arrived at a conception of the moral law which is not very different from the basic moral truths taught in the Sermon on the Mount.'<sup>1</sup> What, then, is the meaning of "perfection" in this context? C. EDLUND, who, like KOOLE, holds that the conditions of Ps xv originally were meant for the Davidic kings but later were 'democratized' and became the fundamental condition for every Israelite, answers: 'loyal towards the covenant, "whole" in his relation both to Yahweh and his fellow men.'<sup>2</sup> As far as we can see, there is no direct evidence in the Old Testament for EDLUND's contention that tamim also denotes loyalty towards men.

Over against WEISER's and EDLUND's view we hold that the meaning of tamim in this context and consequently the first condition of the 'Decalogue' Ps xv is thoroughly cultic. In the light of CLEMENTS' article we may put it this way: At the gate to the Temple, the worshippers are questioned about the loyalty to Yahweh as expressed in their conduct on His land, as His gerim. The first and foremost condition of admittance - according to Ps xv - is that their way of life must be 'tamim', i.e., 'wholly consecrated', namely, to Yahweh, the King of the Temple and Lord of the land. Only under this condition could the purpose of the cult be fulfilled.<sup>3</sup> The rest of the conditions are concerned with the duties of the Israelite towards his fellow men, and they may be called 'moral' or 'ethical'.

Is there - besides Dt xviii. 13 discussed in the previous section - any further evidence for this meaning of Tamim? Our next piece of evidence is from the 'royal thanksgiving' Ps xviii. 20-23 (cf. 2 Sam xxii. 21-24):

---

1 A. WEISER, *Psalms*, p. 169.

2 C. EDLUND, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

3 Cf. R. E. CLEMENTS, *art. cit.*, p. 27: 'For all that it achieved by way of creating a spirit of reverent awe on the part of a devout worshipper, the cult was there to help him to live his every day life under the shadow of the Almighty. It sought in its own way, and by the means which God had laid open to man's use, to assure that Yahweh's goodness and mercy would pursue each loyal citizen of Israel every day of his life, in his home, his piece of land, and in the wider political sphere. This was what the cult was for, not to provide a brief respite from the toils of the world.'



- (20) The Lord rewarded me according to my righteousness;  
according to the cleanness of my hands he recompensed me.
- (21) For I have kept the ways of the Lord,  
and have not wickedly departed from my God.
- (22) For all his ordinances were before me,  
and his statutes I did not put away from me.
- (23) I was 'perfect' with him (thamim 'immo),  
and I kept myself from guilt.

As in Dt xviii.13, the preposition 'im attached to tamim proves that we have to do here with a term denoting relationship. And the context makes it quite clear that the relation is to God, from whom the king has not 'wickedly departed' (vs. 21b). We assume that the word 'guilt' in vs. 23b refers back to the specific guilt mentioned in vs. 21b. Therefore, tamim in this context again may be described as an expression of 'consecration'.

Another instance of tamim is found in the pilgrim-song Ps lxxxiv. 11b. We quote here the vss. 10-12:

- (10) For a day in thy courts is better  
than a thousand elsewhere.  
I would rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God  
than dwell in the tents of wickedness.
- (11) For the Lord God is a sun and shield;  
he bestows favor and honor.  
No good thing does the Lord withhold  
from those who walk in 'perfection' (lahol<sup>e</sup>khim b<sup>e</sup>thamim).
- (12) O Lord of hosts,  
bless the man who trusts in thee.

The prayer for the 'anointed', i.e. the earthly king, in the previous verses 8-9 suggests a pre-exilic origin of this psalm. In the passage quoted, we believe, the 'entrance-liturgy' is reflected, perhaps as preserved in Ps xv. Vs. 11b clearly refers to the first and foremost condition of that Decalogue, and 11, 12 may be paraphrased like this: He who fulfills God's demand of a wholly consecrated life, and thus expresses his trust in the Lord, will be summoned to enter and receive all good things comprised in His blessing.

---

In this connection, we may quote J. PEDERSEN: 'The line between substantive and adjective is undefined. When, e.g., it is said "to wander tamim", Ps. 15, 2; Prov. 28, 18, then it may be an adjective, though, according to the Hebrew *usus loquendi*, it is more likely to be a substantive, which supposition is borne out by the analogous "wander in tamim", Ps. 84, 12.<sup>1</sup> The noun 'tom' is found in Ps xxvi. 1, 11, in a 'prayer for deliverance from personal enemies'.<sup>2</sup> When the author of this prayer claims 'perfection', we believe, he claims to have fulfilled the fundamental condition of admittance to the Temple. We quote here the verses which may reflect the 'entrance-liturgies':

wandern? 757

- (1-3) Vindicate me, O Lord,  
       for I have walked in my 'perfection' (b<sup>e</sup> thummi),  
       and I have trusted in the Lord without wavering.  
 Prove me, O Lord, and try me;  
       test my heart and my mind.  
 For thy steadfast love is before my eyes,  
       and I walk in faithfulness to thee (b<sup>a</sup> amitekha). ...
- (6-8) I wash my hands in innocence,  
       and go about thy altar, O Lord,  
 singing aloud a song of thanksgiving,  
       and telling all thy wondrous deeds.  
 O Lord, I love the habitation of thy house,  
       and the place where thy glory dwells (mishkan k<sup>e</sup> bodhekha). ...
- (11-12) But as for me, I walk in my 'perfection' (b<sup>e</sup> thummi);  
       redeem me and be gracious to me.  
 My foot stands on level ground;  
       in the great congregation I will bless the Lord.

The RSV in these instances translates 'perfection' by 'integrity', and PEDERSEN says, referring to the root tmm, ' "Innocence" is a fairly accurate translation of this word'. He later goes on to say, 'With this "innocence" or integrity the righteous wanders. He acts in integrity, and his acts are integrity, i.e. entirety; this is expressed by his way being whole (Prov. 13, 6; Job 4, 6). When he acts in this manner, then he is himself whole, tamim or tam; thus he is

1 J. PEDERSEN, Israel, Its Life and Culture, I-II (ET), London-Copenhagen 1926, p. 528, n. p 337, 2.

2 OAB, ad loc.

characterized as healthy and normal.<sup>1</sup> The aspect of relationship in this context is described by PEDERSEN as follows: 'From all this it appears how realistic is the Israelitic view of life. To act rightly is not to act according to rules which are forced upon the man from without. The good man acts rightly, because he acts entirely in accordance with the nature of his soul. But the soul exists only as a link in a covenant; it maintains its nature by maintaining the covenant.'<sup>2</sup>

Since the renewal of the covenant was enacted in the temple cult, it is not surprising that even accounts of the oldest covenant-history, e.g., of the covenant at Shechem (Jos xxiv), to some extent seem to reflect the 'entrance-liturgies'.<sup>3</sup> After narrating the history of Yahweh's chosen people, Joshua exhorts the gathered tribes, 'Now therefore fear the Lord, and serve him in sincerity and faithfulness ('ib<sup>e</sup> du 'oto b<sup>e</sup> tamim ube 'emeth, Jos xxiv. 14a) It is quite clear that here again we have to do with conditions of admittance. The choice to serve Yahweh, and this means in a cultic context: to participate in his presence and receive his blessings, is always bound up with certain conditions. The central condition - between (a) to 'fear the Lord', and (c) to serve him in 'faithfulness' - is to serve Yahweh 'in perfection'. The meaning of tamim is explained in the verses 14b and 23: "put away the gods which your fathers served beyond the River, and in Egypt, and serve the Lord." ... 'He said, "Then put away the foreign gods which are among you, and incline your heart to the Lord, the God of Israel." ' As soon as the tribes had answered this time, "The Lord our God we will serve, and his voice we will obey" (vs. 24), they were accepted in the renewed relationship with Yahweh, i.e. the covenant.

On the other hand, the 'entrance-liturgies' seem to have influenced the ancient folktale about Job and its later additions. G. VON RAD points out that Job's question is 'that of "wholeness" (tmh, Job ii. 9) of the relationship with God'.<sup>4</sup> VON RAD later goes on to say 'When he (sc. Job) boasts of his righteousness and the perfection of his relationship to God, he certainly does not regard himself as without sin (Job. xix. 4, ix. 2): he only presupposes a relationship in which God

---

1 Israel I - II, p. 336/37.

2 *ibid.*, p. 337/38; (it goes without saying that the covenant here is with God).

3 Cf. C. EDLUND, *op. cit.*, p. 31, esp. the cit. by LINDHAGEN.

4 G. VON RAD, Theology I, p. 408.



is graciously turned towards man, which he for his part has not broken by any renunciation.' In this, VON RAD says, Job is wholly within the cultic concept,<sup>1</sup> and finally, referring to Job xxxi, xxiif.: 'Here again Job speaks of his wish to be admitted to God's presence, to be submitted to examination'.<sup>2</sup>

It has already been suggested in our section about the concept of initiation that 'those who come to worship were asked for something like a declaration of loyalty to Jahweh's will for justice'.<sup>3</sup> In the present section we found that the expression for this 'loyalty' is *tamim* in the context of the 'entrance-liturgy' Ps xv, and that this 'place in life' and the cultic meaning of 'perfect' most probably is reflected in Pss xviii. 20-23, lxxxiv. 10-12, xxvi. 1-3, 11-12, in Jos xxiv and in the Book of Job. In all these instances, the fundamental question was, as VON RAD says concerning Job, 'that of "wholeness" of the relationship with God,' or, in our own words, to be wholly consecrated to God. However, as at the outset of the present section the suggestion that the Beatitudes may be understood against the background of the 'entrance-liturgies' was repeated, and there is no trace of the term 'perfect' in the Beatitudes, of what use is our present discussion?

Our first answer is this: we shall elsewhere try to show that although the term 'perfect' is not present in the Beatitudes, the Beatitudes as a whole nevertheless have to do with 'perfection'. Second, the idea of 'perfection', or, 'wholeness', is contained also in another expression, which is found both in Mt v. 8, i.e. in the context of the Beatitudes, and in Ps xxiv. 4, i.e. in a second 'entrance-liturgy':

Blessed are the pure in heart (καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ),

for they shall see God.

Who shall ascend the hill of the Lord?

And who shall stand in his holy place?

---

1 G. VON RAD, *Theology I*, p. 414.

2 *ibid.*, p. 415.

3 See above p. 85 ; (cit. VON RAD, *ibid.*, p. 378; however, this cit. suggests originally that in the context of the 'entrance-liturgies' 'loyalty' is expressed by 'righteousness'. This is so in Ps cxviii. 19, 20, but not in the 'entrance-liturgies' Pss xv and xxiv and, as we shall see below in chapter VII, this is not so also in the authentic Sermon on the Mount.)

- (4) He who has clean hands and a pure heart (bhar-lebhabh),  
 who does not lift up his soul to what is false,  
 and does not swear deceitfully.
- (5) He will receive blessing (bh<sup>e</sup> rakhah) from the Lord,  
 and vindication (ç<sup>e</sup> dhaqah) from the God of his salvation.
- (6) Such is the generation of those who seek him,  
 who seek the face of the God of Jacob.

We note, first, the parallelism between Mt v. 8b, 'see God', and ps xxiv. 6b, 'seek the face of God'. The first expression is a cultic term in the Ancient Near East, and it occurs once in the psalms, namely, in Ps xxvii. 4.<sup>1</sup> Second, the parallelism between 'blessing' and 'righteousness' in Ps xxiv. 5 suggests that our former statement in connection with Ps cxviii. 19, 20 needs qualification: ç<sup>e</sup> dhaqah in the context of the 'entrance-liturgies' is not a condition of admittance which must be fulfilled,<sup>2</sup> but rather points to another priestly formula of admittance, i.e. besides Ps cxviii. 26. This conjecture is confirmed by Ezek xviii. 5ff., a passage which reflects the 'entrance-liturgies'. G. VON RAD says in this connection, 'Ezekiel certainly did not compose this series, but the composition of these ten sentences originates from the cultic practice; Ezekiel has built a cultic "form" into his theological discussion. ... Of this text we are interested at present only with the ending

çadhiq hu' hayoh yih<sup>e</sup> yeh

"He is righteous, he shall surely live."

Here we have again such a declaratory formula. As a matter of form it corresponds to a certain extent to the beatitudes which close the liturgy of the gate. After the series of commandments in Ps xv follows the assent, "He who does these things shall never be moved" (vs. 5b), after that of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 142: 'In Babylonia as well as in Egypt it was considered to be a climax in the festival, when the idol was carried out and the curtain drawn aside, so that the congregation might "behold the face of the god", "see the god in his beauty" or "grace". Such terms were also adopted in Israelite religion (cf. Ps 27.4), but there they were taken in a spiritualized sense about the way faith "beholds". But even in Israel this "beholding" was attached to a visible symbol, namely to the holy ark of Yahweh, which to all appearance was a focal point in the festal procession at the enthronement (Ps. 132; cf. 2 Sam. 6).'

<sup>2</sup> See above p. 85.

d/ Ps xxiv, "He will receive blessing from the Lord and vindication from the God of his salvation" (vs. 5). Even the prophetic liturgy in Is xxxiii follows the old cultic tradition in that after the proclaimed commandments (sc. the conditions of admittance, cf. vs. 15) the promise of blessing follows (vs. 16).<sup>1</sup> We may add that in Ezekiel's 'imitation' of the 'entrance-liturgies' to be righteous occurs both as a condition (Ezek xviii.5a) and as a divine declaration or vindication (vs. 9b). Moreover, we note here the same strong legalistic emphasis which we shall find later in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Returning to the expression denoting 'perfection' in the context of the 'entrance-liturgy' Ps xxiv, we may compare it with another version found in Ps li, of which we quote here the most relevant verses:

(10-12) Create in me a clean heart (lebh tahor), O God,  
and put a new and right spirit within me.

Cast me not away from thy presence,  
and take not thy holy Spirit from me.

Restore to me the joy of thy salvation,  
and uphold me with a willing spirit. ...

(15-17) O Lord, open thou my lips,  
and my mouth shall show forth thy praise.

For thou hast no delight in sacrifice;  
were I to give a burnt offering,  
thou wouldst not be pleased.

My sacrifice (zibh<sup>e</sup>hey), O God, is a broken spirit;  
a broken and contrite heart,  
O God, thou wilt not despise.

The appendix to this psalm, namely vss. 18ff., points to the reconstruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, which suggests its present form to be post-exilic. The verses 10-12, however, depict a worshipper praying at the gate and thus perhaps date back to pre-exilic times.<sup>2</sup> At any rate, we may assume that vss. 10-12 reflect the 'entrance-liturgies', in a similar way as we find in the previous verse 7 'a reference to some ceremony of sprinkling (Ex. 12. 22; Lev. 14, 51).'<sup>3</sup> i.e., 'in a purely metaphorical sense.' As we have

1 G. VON RAD, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, (art. Die Anrechnung des Glaubens zur Gerechtigkeit, orig. publ. 1951) München 1958, p. 132/33; cf. also VON RAD, *Theology I*, pp. 378ff.

2 Cf. A. WEISER, *Psalms*, p. 402.

3 *OAB*, n. ad loc.



noted above,<sup>1</sup> 'clean' (tahor) is a 'ritual term'. The 'clean heart' in Ps li. 10 is no condition in the strict sense - for God is its author - but rather a presupposition for the gift of the 'new and right' spirit and, ultimately, of salvation (vs. 12a).

In order to clarify the relationship between man's 'whole being' (nephesh, 'soul'), his 'heart' (leb, lebab), and the 'spirit' (ru<sup>a</sup>h), we quote here the following passages by J. PEDERSEN: 'The heart is the soul as an operating force, and the same holds good of the spirit, ru<sup>a</sup>h. But whereas the heart is at the same time the centre of the soul and the substance gathering round it and determining its strength, the spirit is more particularly the motive power of the soul. It does not mean the centre of the soul, but the strength emanating from it and, in its turn, reacting upon it. Man in his totality is a nephesh, but he has a ru<sup>a</sup>h and a heart. The heart and the spirit act upon the centre and urge it in a certain direction, towards action. "Every man whose heart stirred him up, and every one whom his spirit made willing came and brought Yahweh's offering" (Exod. 35, 21).'<sup>2</sup>

In another context, PEDERSEN says, 'A pure heart (nāḳī, tāhōr, zakh) is the same as a whole heart, for it implies a soul the integrity of which is not broken by foreign wills or contaminating elements. The opposite is a divided heart (Ps. 12, 3).'<sup>3</sup> 'This integrity', PEDERSEN explains, 'can be expressed in different ways. David desires for his son a whole (shālēm) heart to keep the commandments of Yahweh (1 Chron. 29, 19). Here and in a single other place (2 Chron. 25, 2) a word is used of the same root as the one denoting the full development of the soul. But where it is a question of the integrity as an inner presupposition, or, in other words, the health of the soul, the root tmm is used.'<sup>4</sup>

Hence we may say that the following adjectives, or, in the case of tmm, noun

---

1 See above p. 133; (ref. to O. PROCKSCH)

2 J. PEDERSEN, Israel I - II, p. 104.

3 *ibid.*, p. 337.

4 *ibid.*, p. 336.

associated with 'heart' are almost synonymous: 'clean' (tahor), 'whole' (shalem, tam),<sup>1</sup> and - although not mentioned by PEDERSEN - 'pure' (bhar). We may illustrate the use of shalem by the following four examples:

- (a) 'Grant to Solomon my son that with a whole heart (lebbabh shalem) he may keep thy commandments, ...' (1 Chr xxix. 19a).<sup>2</sup>
- (b) 'For the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to show his might in behalf of those whose heart is wholly with him ('iml<sup>e</sup>bhabham shalem 'elaw).' (2 Chr xvi. 9a)
- (c) "Thus you shall do in the fear of the Lord, in faithfulness and with your whole heart (b<sup>e</sup>emunah ub<sup>e</sup>lebbabh shalem).' (2 Chr xix. 9)
- (d) 'And he did what was right in the eyes of the Lord, yet not with a whole heart (b<sup>e</sup>lebbabh shalem).' (2 Chr xxv.2)

The cases where the preposition 'with' ('im)<sup>3</sup> or 'before' (liph<sup>e</sup>ney)<sup>4</sup> are attached to shalem prove that this adjective belongs to the group of terms denoting relationship. Moreover, it is quite clear that the 'whole-hearted'<sup>5</sup> relation ultimately always is to God. Case (d) is especially interesting for the meaning of 'wholeness' expressed by shalem. The interpretation of the first part of 2 Chr xxv.2 is clear from the following context, i.e. vss. 3ff.; King Amaziah obeys the law (vs. 4), as well as God's word through a 'man of God' (vs. 7f). Nevertheless his relation to Yahweh is not 'whole-hearted'. In the parallel text 2 Kg xiv. 3 the second part reads, 'yet not like David his father; he did in all things as Joash his father had done.' The chronicler's explanation of this statement is given in 2 Chr xxv. 14-16 - which has no parallel in 2 Kg - : Amaziah 'brought the gods of the men of Seir, and set them up as his gods, and worshipped them, making offerings to them' (vs. 14b). From this example, then, we may conclude that shalem denotes whole-hearted dedication to the Deity.

J. PEDERSEN, in a negative formulation referring to tmim, puts it like this: '... no secondary wills have their seat in the soul so as to counteract the main will in which its contents

1 We shall discuss the instances with tam in the next section.

2 Cf. also 1 Chr xxviii. 9-10: b<sup>e</sup>lebh shalem; xxix. 9: idem; xxix.19: lebbabh sh.

3 Cf. 1 Kg viii. 61, xi. 4, xv. 3, 14.

4 Cf. 2 Kg xx. 3; and also Is xxxviii. 3.

5 Cf. C. EDLUND, op. cit., p. 38: (German=) 'ganzherzig'; (Swedish=) 'helhjärtad'. However, EDLUND maintains that 'wholeness' can denote relationship both between man and God and between man and man. The only evidence for the second possibility he offers is Jg ix. 16, 19, where - in his view - tamim refers to the covenant with Jerubbaal.

centre, 'namely, Yahweh's will.'<sup>1</sup> Who can claim to fulfil the condition of 'wholeness', 'perfection', namely in the sense of 'Hebrew shalem or tamim (whole and complete, whole-hearted, without breach or inner dividedness)?'<sup>2</sup> - 'The righteous', PEDERSEN answers, 'is always "whole" with those with whom he has entered upon a covenant. His heart is whole (shālēm) with Yahweh because he lives in his covenant; it is also expressed by his being fast to him or for him.'<sup>3</sup>

This takes us back again to the question of 'righteousness'. We recall that the statement in Ps cxviii. 20b referring to the 'gate of the Lord', i.e. '(only) the righteous shall enter through it,' points most probably to Yahweh's decision that the conditions of admittance are fulfilled.<sup>4</sup> May we conclude, then, that 'righteousness' (ḡedheq) and 'perfection' (tom) are synonymous in this context?<sup>5</sup>

The most characteristic difference between the two concepts denoting relationship lies in the fact that whereas Yahweh's 'righteousness' is a subject of praise and proclamation in the Old Testament, the concept of 'perfection' (tamim, tom, shalem) never is applied to Yahweh Himself. This fact often is overlooked.<sup>6</sup> It most probably must be understood against the background of God's 'holiness'.<sup>7</sup> Even if it is still right to

---

1 J. PEDERSEN, *Israel I - II*, p. 336; the beginning of the cit., that we left out because in our opinion 'innocence' has a moralistic element, reads, "Innocence" is a fairly accurate translation of this word (sc. tmim), when by that it is understood that ...'

2 R. BULTMANN, *Theology II*, p. 224.

3 J. PEDERSEN, *ibid.*, p. 341.

4 Cf. G. VON RAD, *Theology I*, p. 379, and above p. 146.

5 This seems to be the opinion of C. EDLUND, *op. cit.*, p. 44; (cf. cit FRANKENBERG).

6 Cf. C. EDLUND, *ibid.*, p. 45: 'After the previous findings it is not surprising that tamim is used as an epithet for Yahweh himself.'

7 Cf. TH. C. VRIEZEN, *Theology*, p. 161, n. 4: 'That the words denoting perfection were not applied to Yahweh may be best explained from the fact that the ideas that fundamentally meant "sound", "complete", were not considered elevated enough to denote the holy God. God is rich in (ethical) virtues, but transcends the human ethical standards.' In our view, this last sentence needs qualification in that - at least in the instances discussed in the present section - tamim and the similar expressions do not refer to a 'human ethical standard', but are relational concepts.



say for pre-Exilic times that the term 'holy' indicates a relationship more than a quality',<sup>1</sup> the distance between the holy God and the worshipper is immense. On the other hand, the sacrificial act 'bridges' this distance in that the sacrificial animal in its 'wholeness' is given up to the Deity. Although theologically speaking the decisive point in this act is the willingness of Yahweh to accept the offering, it is quite clear that the renewal 'happens' from the worshipper to God, and not vice versa. In other words, the renewal of the relation is inaugurated by the 'consecration' of the worshipper to God, and not by the 'consecration' of God to the worshipper. This implies for our problem: the adjective tamim, if applied to God, could mean that the Deity was being drawn down to human level. There is indeed a passage in the psalms which comes very near to expressing just this, namely Ps xviii. 25-27:

With the loyal (ḥaṣīdh) thou dost show thyself loyal (ḥaṣīdh);  
 with the perfect (tamim) man thou dost show thyself perfect  
 (titamman);  
 with the pure (nabhar) thou dost show thyself pure (tit<sup>e</sup>barar);  
 and with the crooked (iqesh) thou dost show thyself perverse  
 (tith<sup>e</sup>patal);

For thou dost deliver a humble people;  
but the haughty eyes thou dost bring down.

In verse 30a, in 'an exuberant outburst of confidence in what he can accomplish with God's help,<sup>2</sup> the psalmist almost applies tamim to the Deity:

ha 'el tamim dar<sup>e</sup>ko = The God is perfect as to his way.

According to its title, Ps xviii is a 'Servant Song' (1<sup>e</sup> 'ebhedh YHWH 1<sup>e</sup> dhawid), i.e. a royal psalm, which perhaps is composed by David or a poet of his court.<sup>3</sup> It was used in the cult, and 'its main purpose was to establish and safeguard the "grace of kingship"'.<sup>4</sup> These are the principal points of A. WEISER's comment on vss. 25-27: The king here expresses 'that universal truth ... that man's behaviour determines God's action.' This is to say, 'God remains faithful to his nature, but that faithfulness operates differently according to the way in which man responds

1 G. VON RAD, Theology I, p. 205; the ref. is to H. RINGGREN, The Prophetic Conception of Holiness, Uppsala-Leipzig 1948, p. 13.

2 OAB, ad. loc.

3 Cf. A. WEISER, *Psalms*, pp. 185ff.

4 *ibid.*, p. 187.

to it. ... the godly (sc. *hasidh*) can be assured of the perfection of the faithfulness of God only by being absolutely faithful to him, and only he who is pure is admitted to the presence of God whose nature is pure. ... On the other hand, those who are perverted ... see him in this light just because, in opposition to those who are disobedient, he carries his order into effect and executes his judgment.<sup>1</sup>

If we may understand *tamim* in vs. 30a against its cultic background, we can paraphrase it as follows:

- (30)           The God is wholly consecrated to Himself;  
                   the word of Yahweh is purified;  
                   he is a shield for all those who take refuge in Him.

In the following two passages, the law and the work of Yahweh respectively are called *tamim*:

- (a)           The law of the Lord is perfect<sup>2</sup> (*t<sup>e</sup> mimah*),  
                   reviving the soul;  
                   the testimony of the Lord is sure (*ne<sup>3</sup> emanah*),  
                   making wise the simple;  
                   the precepts of the Lord are right (*y<sup>e</sup> sharim*),  
                   rejoicing the heart;  
                   the commandment of the Lord is pure (*barah*),  
                   enlightening the eyes;  
                   the fear of the Lord is clean (*t<sup>e</sup> horah*),  
                   enduring for ever.  
                   the ordinances of the Lord are true (*emet*),  
                   and righteous (*cadheq*) altogether. (Ps xix. 7-9)

This passage is highly artificial: the six bicola begin with nouns that are synonyms. From this we may conclude that the adjectives added to these nouns also were meant to be synonymous. As two of them originally are ritual terms, namely 'pure' and 'clean', is *tamim* here a cultic term? In our opinion, this is not so; the secular meaning 'complete' fits better.

---

1 A. WEISER, *Psalms*, p. 193.

2 We note that here, in Ps xviii.30 and in Dt xxxii. 4 the RSV renders *tamim* by 'perfect', obviously because it is used in connection with Yahweh, but never when the reference is to sacrificial animals or men. If this is meant to suggest that 'perfect' is the highest stage of a development which, of course, God alone can reach, this is a misunderstanding of the OT concept, which, as we have seen, never is applied to Yahweh Himself.

(b) For I will proclaim the name of the Lord.  
 Ascribe greatness to our God;  
 The Rock, his work is perfect (tamim);  
 for all his ways are justice (mishpat).  
 A God of faithfulness ( <sup>a</sup>munah) and without iniquity,  
 just (çadiq) and right (yashar) is he. (Dt xxxii. 3,4)

The text is important for us because 'probably it dates from a time during the monarchy'.<sup>1</sup> Again we note - to say the least - the reluctance to apply the adjective tamim to Yahweh Himself, whilst without hesitation he is çadiq, yashar, etc. Does this imply that the author is aware of the technical cult-term tamim? Together with the following context, this passage contrasts God's faithfulness and the 'integrity' of his 'work' with the perversity of Israel. Consequently, we may assume that Yahweh's 'consecration' to his people is in the mind of the psalmist, although he expresses it indirectly by speaking of the divine work rather than of the Deity. We hold this to be the right interpretation for this - over against the former - instance, because in Dt xxxii it is not the transcendence of Yahweh but his nearness that is emphasized:

Is he not your father, who created you,  
 who made you and established you? (vs. 6b)

We may add here that in Mt v.48 God's fatherhood and 'perfection' is combined.

Throughout the Old Testament, God is called 'just' or 'righteous' (çadiq). The concept of ç<sup>e</sup> dhaqah has for long been misunderstood in the sense of 'a man's proper conduct over against an absolute ethical norm, a legality which derives its norm from the absolute idea of justice. From this absolute norm, it was supposed, issued absolute demands and absolute claims.' Over against this it is now realised that 'ancient Israel did not in fact measure a line of conduct or an act by an ideal norm, but by the specific relationship in which the partner had at the time to prove himself true.'<sup>2</sup> Hence it follows that 'righteousness' can mean very different things for different persons and, above all, for God over against man.

'Justice', J. PEDERSEN explains, 'is most frequently a claim on the stronger, the claim

---

1 OAB, ad loc.

2 G. VON RAD, Theology I, p. 370/71.



implying that he receives the weaker into his will and self-maintenance. ... He who prays confidently appeals to justice: "Hear me, O God of my righteousness!" (Ps. 4, 2). "Hear, Yahweh, the right, attend unto my cry, give ear unto my prayer" (Ps. 17, 1). This is the fundamental chord struck in the Psalms. The weak Israelite is only to submit his soul entirely to the strong soul of his god; in that his justice consists. - Righteousness is thus the mutual acknowledgment of souls; but it is still more, viz. their mutual maintenance of each others' honour. The acknowledgment can never exclusively be a feeling or a mood, but it must manifest itself in action.<sup>1</sup>

Thus when Israel applies the concept of righteousness to Yahweh, this is an expression of trust and submission to the God who deals with everyone according to the specific relationship and occasion implied. The relationship with Yahweh, of course, 'was chiefly maintained in the cult.'<sup>2</sup> This is especially clear from the passage Ps xlviii.9-11. 'Righteousness' is also found in descriptions of theophanies (cf. Pss 1.6, xcvi. 6, lxxxv. 13; Hos x. 12).<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, in Deutero-Isaiah  $\zeta^e$  dhaqah became a synonym for salvation (cf. Is xlv.8, xlvi.13, li.6,8).

Here lies the difference between tamim and the otherwise so similar term çadiq: whereas the latter is always conditioned by the nature of the relationship and the person implied, so that in the extreme case it can denote 'submission' to the Deity on the side of the worshipper, and 'salvation' on the side of Yahweh, 'perfection' always is unconditional. Israel is either 'wholly consecrated' to Yahweh - or against Him. However, we now realise that in the context of the 'entrance-liturgies' as a matter of fact the absolute condition of 'perfection' (holek tamim, Ps xv.2; bhar-lebhabh, Ps xxiv. 4) is identical with the specific 'righteousness' of this occasion, namely, 'to submit his soul entirely to the strong soul of his God'. By this submission at the gate the worshipper maintains the honour of the Lord in His Temple, and therefore he may enter through it (Ps cxviii. 19, 20; Ez xviii.9).

---

1 J. PEDERSEN, Israel I - II, p. 344/45.

2 G. VON RAD, Theology I, p. 372.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 373; the ref. is to K. KOCH, Sdq im Alten Testament (Dissertation), Heidelberg 1953, pp. 4ff.

Is there any evidence for the aspect of 'unconditionality' inherent in the cultic term *tamim*? Of course, we cannot expect that this aspect is discussed in the cult psalms. However, with all due reserve in simplifying the complexity of the work, we may say that this aspect is one of the themes of the Book of Job. With G. VON RAD - as pointed out already above<sup>1</sup> - we hold that this book reflects a cultic situation, or, more especially, the 'entrance-liturgies'. There is a great difference between the pre-exilic prose narrative which depicts Job as a man who is 'perfect and upright' (*tam w<sup>c</sup> yashar*, i. 1), i.e. a 'man wholly sheltered in his faith and his commitment to God', and the later dialogues in the chapters iii-xlii, where we find 'one sinking into all the depths of abandonment by God, and accusing him, indeed a blasphemous and scorning Job.'<sup>2</sup>

In the old narrative, Job suddenly was struck by disaster, not only in spite of the 'wholeness' of his relationship with God, but with the consent and the power of God.

"But the Lord said to Satan ...

"He still holds fast his integrity (*b<sup>c</sup> thummatho*), although you moved me against him, to destroy him without cause." (ii. 3)

Again the Lord gave power to strike Job, stopping short only before his life

(ii. 6) "Then his wife said to him, "Do you still hold fast your integrity (*b<sup>c</sup> thummathekha*)? Curse God and die." But he said to her, "You speak as one of the foolish women would speak. Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?" ... (ii. 9, 10).

We venture to interpret 'perfection' in this context as follows: both Satan and Job's wife expect, and the latter even advises Job in this sense, to renounce his 'integrity', i.e. his perfect relation to God, because he does not 'receive good at the hand of God'. In ii. 10, Job apparently points to the aspect of 'unconditionality' in the concept of perfection: the wholeness of his consecration to God does not depend on the reward he gets from God.

---

<sup>1</sup> See above p. 145.

<sup>2</sup> G. VON RAD, *Theology I*, p. 409.

In the later dialogues, 'in Job's relationship to God there can be discerned a growing estrangement, an ever-widening gulf. He has here sunk down into an abyss of terror which far outstrips anything the psalmists had to say.'<sup>1</sup> In this abyss, Job begins to question God:

If it is a contest of strength, behold him!

If it is a matter of justice, who can summon him?

Though I am innocent, my own mouth would condemn me;

though I am perfect (tam<sup>2</sup>-ani ), he would prove me perverse.

I am perfect (tam<sup>2</sup>-ani ); I regard not myself;

I loathe my life.

It is all one; therefore I say,

he destroys both the perfect (tam) and the wicked.

When disaster brings sudden death,

he mocks at the calamity of the innocent.

The earth is given into the hand of the wicked;

he covers the faces of its judges -

if it is not he, who then is it? (ix. 19-24)

Perhaps we may put Job's problem reflected in these words in this way: God demands from man to be 'perfect', i.e. wholly consecrated, whole-heartedly dedicated, to Him. But what about His own perfection? Who judges His relation to man?<sup>2</sup> Of course, there is only one answer to this, namely, God is His own judge. Therefore, Job in a later passage says:

"Lay down a pledge for me with thyself;

who is there that will give surety for me?" (xvii.3)<sup>3</sup>

The solution offered by the book of Job falls short of what Job expected in this verse; the time had not yet come for a divine pledge of perfection (cf. Mt v. 48b). Job stops questioning God in a rebellious way and maintains God's honour in that he submits to Him wholly and unconditionally:

---

1 G. VON RAD, *Theology I*, p. 413/14; cf. also *ibid.*, p. 412: 'What does Job know of the saving orders of the cult or of what Jahweh had rooted in the history? It is an existence totally without community or saving history that Job in steelly isolation carries on his struggle with God.'

2 Cf. Job ix.33: ' "There is no umpire between us", not merely an umpire who decides, but a conciliator, a go-between, an intermediary, a mediator, since such a being "would lay his hand upon us both".' (OAB, ad loc.)

3 Cf. the previous verse xvi. 21, where 'in all probability the poet remembers the earlier theme of the mediator (9.33-35). Progress of thought, however, leads Job to abandon that dream and to substitute for it a present certainty.' (OAB, ad loc) Cf. also VON RAD, *ibid.*, p. 416, n.66.



- (xlii.2) 'I know that thou canst do all things,  
and that no purpose of thine can be thwarted.
- (3) "Who is this that hides counsel  
without knowledge?"<sup>1</sup>  
Therefore I have uttered what I did not understand,  
things too wonderful for me, which I did not know.
- (4) "Hear, and I will speak;  
I will question you, and you declare to me."<sup>2</sup>
- (5) I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear,  
but now my eye sees thee;
- (6) therefore I despise myself,  
and repent in dust and ashes.'

Admittedly, the term *tamim* does not occur in this passage. Nevertheless, we believe, we have to do here with a description of what we may call the realisation of perfection. This is to say, Job, who again is wholly consecrated to God, experiences that He 'has come to him personally; the upholder of the universe cares for a lonely man so deeply that he offers him the fulness of his communion':<sup>3</sup> 'but now my eye sees thee'. It will be shown below in chapter VII that Mt v.8 expresses a similar experience:

Blessed are the pure in heart (i.e. the 'perfect'),  
for they shall see God.

As we have noted above,<sup>4</sup> the expression 'see God' stems from the temple cult. This is in accordance with the observation that in the first 'place in life' perfection must be understood against the background of the fundamental cultic experience of Israel, namely the epiphany of Yahweh. As Job, even if he is 'remote in his individualistic isolation and struggling for the clarification of his shattered relationship to God still moves wholly within the ideas and concepts by

---

1 Cf. *OAB*, ad loc: 'A quotation from 38.2; Job acknowledges his finitude.'

2 *ibid.*, ad. loc: 'An echo of the divine questioning (40.7), preparing for the confession of the following lines.'

3 *ibid.*, ad. vs. 5.

4 See p. 146, and n.1 (cit. MOWINCKEL)

means of which Jahweh hitherto dealt with his own in the cult,<sup>1</sup> his vision of God is to be interpreted against the same background.<sup>2</sup> The special significance of Job's experience lies in the fact that what usually happens in the Temple cult is a reality outside the Temple, namely, Yahweh's coming, His gracious Presence.<sup>3</sup> This corroborates the view that 'the cult was intended to actualise the divine activity on earth.'<sup>4</sup>

In this connection, we may again recall the important saying Dt xviii.13: 'You shall be wholly consecrated (tamim ... 'im) Yahweh your God.' As a matter of fact, the pre-supposition for this imperative is the indicative immanu el, i.e. 'God with us' (cf. Is vii. 14). WILHELM VISCHER has put forward the thesis that in Isaiah the sign "Immanuel" points to a contemporary of the prophet, and that the series of oracles to which the message of Immanuel belongs is 'marked from beginning to end by the terminology of official and cultic texts for the succession to the throne in the house of David.'<sup>5</sup> According to VISCHER, the purpose of the prophet Isaiah was this: 'As an authorized special agent of God and a trustee of the family of David he proclaims that God will carry out what he pledged to do, and even more than that.'<sup>6</sup> He replaces Ahaz by Immanuel, the son of David par excellence. With him and through him he realises in the deepest and most complete sense the words and rites of the royal festival of Zion.<sup>6</sup> It is well known that the Gospel of Matthew points out that this Old Testament sign actually was fulfilled in Jesus (cf. Mt ii. 22, 23).

It goes without saying that the Immanuel contemporary to Isaiah for his part was supposed to be 'tamim ... 'im YHWH', i.e. wholly consecrated to Yahweh. Even if it is not likely, as J. L. KOOLE suggests, that Ps xv exclusively is a royal 'entrance-liturgy', there is evidence

---

1 G. VON RAD, *Theology I*, p. 414.

2 See however OAB, ad Job xlii. 5: 'The contrast between belief through tradition and faith through prophetic vision.' (Our spacing)

3 Cf. G. VON RAD, *ibid.*, p. 417: 'The real fascination of this poem lies in its marginal theological situation - how will Jahweh still be able to express himself in any way in a situation where the people of God, the cult, and the saving history no longer have theological relevance? But Yahweh had appeared there too, outside of these, and had revealed himself in person and with consolation to one who up till then had only known him by hearsay (Job. xlii. 5)'

4 R. E. CLEMENTS, *art. cit.*, p. 27.

5 W. VISCHER, *Die Immanuel-Botschaft im Rahmen des königlichen Zionfestes*, TS Heft 45, Zollikon-Zürich 1955, *cit.* p. 47, cf. p. 52. VISCHER adopts the hypothesis about the existence of a 'royal festival on Zion' put forward by H. J. KRAUS (see above p.79,n.1) as a working hypothesis.

6 *ibid.*, p. 47.

for the statement that the fundamental cultic condition of 'perfection' was of special significance for the king, and that, we believe, because he was the representative of the people before God.<sup>1</sup>

(a) Our first example, of course, is David, the royal ideal of perfection. In 1 Kg ix. 4 the function of 'perfection' as a condition is quite clear: 'And as for you', God says to Solomon, 'if you will walk before me, as David your father walked, with integrity of heart (b<sup>e</sup> tham-lebhabh) and with uprightness (b<sup>e</sup> yosher), doing according to all that I have commanded you, and keeping my statutes and my ordinances, ...' (cf. Ps lxxviii. 72).

(b) However, Solomon did not live up to the condition of perfection: 'For when Solomon was old his wives turned away his heart after other gods; and his heart was not wholly consecrated to (shalem 'im) the Lord his God, as was the heart of David his father.' (1 Kg xi. 4) In this statement the cultic character of 'perfection' is especially clear: it exclusively denotes relation to God (or, gods).

(c) In 1 Kg xv. 3 we read about Jeroboam, 'And he walked in all the sins which his father did before him; and his heart was not wholly consecrated to (shalem 'im) the Lord his God as the heart of David's father.'

(d) And in the same chapter, vs. 14, we are told, '... Nevertheless the heart of Asa was wholly consecrated to (shalem 'im) the Lord all his days.'

(e) Finally, in Hezekiah's prayer (Is xxxviii. 3 // 2 Kg xx.3) a wider range of conditions of admittance is reflected: '...Remember now, O Lord, I beseech thee, how I have walked before thee in faithfulness (b<sup>e</sup> emeth) and with a whole heart (b<sup>e</sup> lebh shalem), and have done what is good (hatob) in thy sight.'

To sum up this section: By now it has become clear that tamim in the first 'place in life' is a thoroughly cultic term, in that it denotes the 'wholeness' of the relationship between the worshipper and his God, and, moreover, that it must be understood against the background of the cultic theophany. Furthermore, we have seen that the concept of

---

1 Cf. J. L. KOOLE, art. cit., p. 107, where he points out the relation between Pss xv and ci. The latter being a 'Regentenspiegel' (i.e. a 'mirror' for the ruler), this relation supports - in KOOLE's view - his hypothesis. We shall discuss Ps ci in the following section.



perfection in its first 'place in life', is expressed also by the terms 'pure' (bhar), 'clean' (tahor), 'whole' (shalem, tam) associated with 'heart'. The meaning of perfection essentially is that of entire consecration to the Deity, recalling the well-known sacrificial ritual, in which the sacrificial animal in its 'wholeness', 'entirety' (tamim) is given up to Yahweh. So as in the sacrificial ritual the relation between the worshipper and God is renewed at the moment the Deity accepts the offering, 'perfection' is realised when God accepts the worshipper into the fulness of His communion. In the temple cult, the realisation of perfection is connected with the concept of theophany.

In this connection, the significance of MOWINCKEL's thesis of the two-fold 'place in life' of the decalogical tradition emerges clearly. If we understand it from the concept of perfection present in both 'places', we recognise first a theological difficulty, which we may put like this: Must man first fulfil God's conditions of acceptance in order to enter into his presence and communion, or, does God first reveal Himself to man, and only then man is able to turn to God in entire consecration? As a matter of logic, this problem is insoluble.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, MOWINCKEL's thesis is very plausible and practical. For no one would wish to deny that there must have been a clearly distinguished 'place' in the temple cult of (1) conditions which must be fulfilled on the part of the worshipper in order to be 'worthy' of the presence of God, and (2) exhortations imparted to the worshipper in order to 'keep' him in the communion (covenant) with God. The difference of these two parts of the liturgy of the Temple is a matter of function, and as such, the difference is unmistakeable. However, the two 'places' have a common background in the cultic theophany, which follows the fulfilment of the conditions of admittance, and is presupposed by the divine 'directions' of the covenant. We now turn to the second 'place in life'.

---

<sup>1</sup> In practice, there is, of course, no difficulty, because usually the worshippers return to the Temple. In other words, 'entry' into God's presence in the Temple is no unrepeatable rite of 'initiation' but belongs to a series of 'initiations' into God's presence. The worshippers of all times feel that they come from God to God.

### 3 The second 'place in life' of tamim

The second 'place in life' of tamim is supposed to be identical with the last phase of the New Year festival in ancient Israel, which we left undiscussed in our reconstruction of that festival according to S. MOWINCKEL's interpretation of the relevant cult psalms.<sup>1</sup> Thus the present section concludes not only the discussion about the 'place in life' and the meaning of perfection in the Old Testament, but at the same time what we have called the 'presupposition' of the Sermon on the Mount, i.e. chapter III.

At the end of our previous section we have already suggested that the concept of theophany links the first to the second 'place in life' of tamim. MOWINCKEL says, while understanding the renewal of the covenant as a new development in connection with the New Year and Enthronement festival of the time of the monarchy, 'As the ritual of the great annual feast of Jerusalem developed there occurred several points where the traditions about the making of the fundamental covenant and its conditions, the commandments, could link on. One such link was provided by the idea of Yahweh's epiphany. The announcement of Yahweh's epiphany in order to renew the covenant would lead to an emphasis on, and enforcement of, the fundamental commandments on which the covenant rested. In Pss. 95 and 81 we find just this presentation and enforcement. "Today", Yahweh again admonishes his people, warning them to hear his voice (95.7) - "today", on the day when the covenant is renewed and the commandments announced, as they were at Sinai.'<sup>2</sup> Of course, this is not to say that the aspect of the renewal of the covenant, or, of the communion with the Deity, was missing altogether before the phase of

---

1 See above p. 99.

2 S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 157/58; cf. also *ibid.*, p. 156/57: 'But these psalms (sc. xciv and lxxxix) also prove the organic connexion between the idea of a renewal of the covenant and that of epiphany and of the statement of the commandments of the covenant. The first part of Ps. 95 is evidently an enthronement hymn. Now the king, Yahweh, creator of the world and of Israel, has come to take his seat on his throne and receive the homage of his people; in the second part of the psalm it is as a king renewing the covenant - through the mouth of the cultic prophet - that he recalls the first making of the covenant and the faithlessness of the people at Meriba and Massah, and warns against breaking the commandments of the covenant.'

development described here by MOWINCKEL.

In order to illustrate MOWINCKEL's point, we quote here the verses 7b-11 of Ps xcv, which follow on the homage of the enthroned heavenly King rendered by his people (cf. vss. 6-7a):

- (7b) O that today you would hearken to his voice !  
 (8) Harden not your hearts, as at Meribah,  
       as on the day at Massah in the wilderness,  
 (9) when your fathers tested me,  
       and put me to the proof,  
       though they had seen my work.  
 (10) For forty years I loathed that generation and said,  
       "They are a people who err in heart,  
       and they do not regard my ways."  
 (11) Therefore I have sworn in my anger,  
       that they should not enter my rest.<sup>1</sup>

Although Ps 1 seems to date from comparatively late times, it is of interest in this connection, because, according to a tradition in the Mishna, it belongs to the Feast of Tabernacles.<sup>2</sup> The psalm begins with a description of Yahweh's epiphany:

- (2) Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty (mikh<sup>e</sup>lal-yophi),<sup>3</sup>  
       God shines forth (hophi<sup>a</sup>).  
 (3) Our God comes, he does not keep silence,  
       before him is a devouring fire,  
       round about him a mighty tempest. ...  
 (7) "Hear, O my people, and I will speak,  
       O Israel, I will testify against you.  
       I am God, y o u r God.

'The exhortation contained in Pss 1, lxxxii and xcv', J. L. KOOLE says, 'has its place in a way that the assumption of a proclamation of God's laws, perhaps in form of a Decalogue, is

---

1 Cf. OAB, ad loc, the ref. to the 'entrance-liturgies' Pss xv, xxiv. 3-6.

2 Cf. S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 161.

3 This is, so to speak, a non-cultic synonym for 'perfection', which in this form only occurs here in the OT. (Cf. however Ezek xxiii. 12f.; xxvii. 24)



inevitable.<sup>1</sup> The passage Ps 1.16-20 illustrates this statement, and is also interesting for its content, which reminds us of the Antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount (Mt v. 21-48):

- (16) But to the wicked God says:  
 "What right have y o u to recite m y statutes,  
 or take my covenant on your lips?
- (17) For you hate discipline,  
 and you cast my words behind you.
- (18) If you see a thief, you are a friend of his;  
 and you keep company with adulterers. (cf. Mt v.27-30)
- (19) You give your mouth free rein for evil,  
 and your tongue frames deceit. (cf. Mt v. 37)
- (20) You sit and speak against your brother;  
 you slander your own mother's son." (cf. Mt v. 21-22)

It is difficult to see to what extent the liturgy of the Temple in ancient Israel included the proclamation of divine instructions. 'On the whole', MOWINCKEL says, 'the reading of "lessons" seems to have played an inconspicuous part in the temple service, even after Judaism had her Holy Scriptures. The only clear evidence seems to be the reading of the "law of the covenant" (Deuteronomy) every seven years at the feast of Tabernacles (Deut. 31.10ff.), a custom which obviously originated from the cultic rite of announcing Yahweh's basic commandments as part of the ritual of the covenant.'<sup>2</sup>

Ps lxxx provides a link with the Decalogue Ex xx.1ff. // Dt v.6ff., for in vs.11 God 'reveals himself to the congregation through the ancient "formula of epiphany", referring to the traditions of the Exodus and of Sinai.'<sup>3</sup> We quote here vss. 8-16:

- (8) Hear, O my people, while I admonish you!  
 O Israel, if you would but listen to me!
- (9) There shall be no strange god among you;  
 you shall not bow down to a foreign god.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 J. L. KOOLE, art. cit., p. 100/01.

2 S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 169.

3 *ibid.*, p. 157; cf. also attached n. 139.

4 Cf. the first commandment of the Decalogue, Ex xx.3 par.

- (10) I am the Lord your God,  
       who brought you up out of the land of Egypt.  
       Open your mouth wide, and I will fill it.
- (11) But my people did not listen to my voice;  
       Israel would have none of me.
- (12) So I gave them over to their stubborn hearts,  
       to follow their own counsels.
- (13) O that my people would listen to me,  
       that Israel would walk in my ways!
- (14) I would soon subdue their enemies,  
       and turn my hand against their foes.
- (15) Those who hate the Lord would cringe toward him,  
       and their fate would last for ever.
- (16) I would feed you with the finest of the wheat,  
       and with honey from the rock I would satisfy you."

The last two lines of this cult psalm promise a rich harvest, and thus allow us to identify the festival to which it belongs, namely, to the New Year festival. MOWINCKEL holds that the single cola 7b (Heb. 8b) and 10b (Heb. 11b) belong together: 'if 11b is replaced behind 8b we shall have quite regular stanzas throughout the whole psalm.'<sup>1</sup> He comments in this connection, "The festival of harvest and new year became the festival of the renewal of the historical covenant; and among its "festal myths" may also be mentioned a myth about the making of the covenant, in terms which bring out quite clearly that the word "myth" may also indicate the religious and cultic conception and formulation of a historical fact.'<sup>2</sup>

WALTER GUTBROD says about the 'place in life' of some old legal corpora in the Old Testament, including the Decalogue Ex xx. 2ff. par.: 'The situation in life of these Israelite laws was that act which was performed regularly at the central shrine to renew and commemorate Yahweh's covenant with Israel. ... They are an expression of Yahweh's claim to reign over the whole life of the people belonging to him in virtue of his choice.

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 157, n. 140.

2 *ibid.*, p. 157.

This is declared as clearly as possible by the first commandment of the Decalogue.<sup>1</sup>

As we have said repeatedly, the character of the festival in question at the time of the monarchy is still disputed among Old Testament scholars. Some Continental scholars tend to regard the concept of the covenant,<sup>2</sup> or, more especially, the Decalogue<sup>3</sup> as its central feature. As far as we can see, this is a question of development of worship in ancient Israel and of a shift of emphasis at different stages of development. Perhaps, this development was as follows: (1) The central feature of the festival at Shechem was the renewal of the Sinai-covenant; (2) the great annual feast of Jerusalem, i.e. the ancient feast of harvest, at the beginning of the Davidic monarchy focussed on the enthronement of Yahweh as King, and his anointed. As we have seen, this feature is of Canaanite origin. At this time the Davidic covenant, which was renewed through the king as the representative of the people, was linked to the concept of Yahweh's epiphany and enthronement; (3) about the time of the Deuteronomy, the traditions of the Davidic and the Sinai-covenant merged, and there was a new emphasis on the old historical features over against the mythical background of the Canaanite festival and, above all, on the fundamental commandments on which the covenant between Yahweh and his people rested.<sup>4</sup> The Decalogue Ex xx. 2ff. par. seems in its present form to belong to this third stage of development.<sup>5</sup> May we assume that this Decalogue was recited annually at the Feast of Tabernacles, whereas the whole 'law of the covenant', i.e. the Deuteronomy (cf. Dt xxxi. 10ff.) was read 'at the end of every seven years'? We cannot be certain on this

---

1 (H. KLEINKNECHT and) W. GUTBORD, Law (ET - BKW), London 1962, p. 23/24.

2 Cf. A. WEISER, Psalms, Introduction, esp. p. 28/29: 'The theme of the Old Testament Covenant Festival is the continually renewed encounter of God with his people which has as its final aim the renewal of the Sinai Covenant and of the salvation it promised.' Cf. also W. EICHRODT, Theology I, pp. 36ff., and W. GUTBORD, *ibid.*, p. 24: 'Now this "situation" of the law is the conception of the covenant.' (The attached n. 2 refers to EICHRODT, *ibid.*, pp. 70ff.)

3 Cf. G. VON RAD, Theology I, p. 192: '... the Decalogue formed the mid-point and climax of a very solemn event, namely, the festival of the renewal of the covenant at Shechem, which, as may be deduced from Deut. xxxi. 10f., took place every seven years.'

4 See above pp. 98f.; 161(cit. MOWINCKEL).

5 Cf. G. VON RAD, *ibid.*, p. 190; see also *ibid.*; 'The first (sc. of older series of commandments) to be mentioned in this connexion would be the Shechemite Dodecalogue (Deut. xxvii. 15ff.) ...' Other series mentioned by VON RAD are Ex xxi. 12, 15-17; Lev xix. 13-18. Cf. on this also W. GUTBORD, *ibid.*, p. 23.



point. The development in later Judaism, however, suggests a frequent use of the Decalogue in Jewish worship.<sup>1</sup>

The 'formula of epiphany' in Ex xx. 2 par. and in Ps lxxxi.10 leaves little doubt that the two texts belong to the 'second' 'place in life', and that in the structure of the feast of Tabernacles. As a matter of content, however, Ps lxxxi and the Decalogue are very different. The former reminds the people more generally of the 'ways' of Yahweh (vs. 13), whereas the latter gives a list of Yahweh's ten basic commandments:

- (vs. 2) "I am the Lord your God,  
who brought you out of the land of Egypt,  
out of the house of bondage.
- 1 (vs.3) You shall have no other gods before me. (cf. Mt v.48a)
- 2(vss.4-6) You shall not make for yourself a graven image, ...
- 3(vs.7) You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain, ... (cf. Mt v.33-37)
- 4(8-11) Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. ...
- 5(vs.12) Honor your father and your mother, ...
- 6(vs.13) You shall not kill. (cf. Mt v.21)
- 7(vs.14) You shall not commit adultery. (cf. Mt v.27)
- 8(vs.15) You shall not steal
- 9(vs.16) You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor.
- 10(vs.17) You shall not covet your neighbor's house; ..."

It is well-known that the Antitheses, or at least, some of the Antitheses, must be understood against the background of this Decalogue. However, the reference to Mt v. 48a after the first commandment may be startling at first sight. In fact, the relationship between Ex xx.3 and the concept of perfection can be established already within the Old Testament. Most important for our purpose is the correspondance between the first commandment of this Decalogue and the first condition of the Decalogue Ps xv. In accordance with its specific 'place in life', 'perfection' in the former is expressed negatively.

---

1 Cf. W. GUTBROD, *Law*, p. 67: 'The ten commandments ought really to be recited daily; and why are they not recited? Because there is no wish to provide a basis for the assertions of heretics, so that they cannot say that these alone were given at Sinai (are divine)' (J. Ber. 3c 32f.). GUTBROD quotes this passage from J. Wohlgemuth, 'Das jüdische Religionsgesetz in jüdischer Beleuchtung', *Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Rabbinerseminars in Berlin* (1921) p. 21. GUTBROD's own point is clear from the sentence previous to the cit., 'Thus torah can certainly be used in particular for the Decalogue, but the Decalogue is never by itself the Torah.'

The relationship between the first commandment and *tamim* has been observed already by G. VON RAD. 'One interpretation of the first commandment', he says, 'is given by the Old Testament itself, and to begin with we must keep to it. In three passages the commandment to shun alien cults has an allusion to Jahweh's "zeal" connected with it - "for Jahweh is a zealous God" (Ex. xx. 5, xxxiv. 14; Deut. vi. 14f.).'<sup>1</sup> In each of them the final clause introduced by "for" is to be taken as a legitimation, that is, as a theological substantiation. But there are other references as well which bring this commandment, or its breach, into connexion with Jahweh's zeal in the same characteristic way (thus, for example, Josh. xxiv. 19; Deut. xxxii. 16; 1 Kings xiv. 22).'<sup>2</sup> Some pages later, VON RAD states, 'The most concise definition of the demands which Jahweh's zeal laid upon Israel is given in Deuteronomy - Israel is to be "perfect" (*tamim*) with Jahweh (Deut. xviii. 13).'<sup>3</sup>

The negative formulation of 'perfection' in Ex xx. 3 must be understood, as said above, from its 'place in life'. In this connection, W. GUTBROD has made some pertinent remarks: '(b) The negative character of these commands, or, consequently rather, of these prohibitions. In this way again it is distinctly confirmed that the theological situation of this law is the covenant of election. It is not a matter of commanding that which makes a man belong to God, but of forbidding that which abolishes this relationship.'<sup>4</sup> 'The "reward" can thus consist only in this positive relationship to Yahweh. ... (d) Furthermore, in spite of its brevity this law is comprehensive. It is not only the cult of Yahweh, but the whole of life which stands under the law. The claim of this God to rule leaves no neutral zone. ... (e) Finally it is in the nature of these laws that they are addressed to Israel as a whole. The individual is treated as a member of the nation, and the neighbour whom the law indicates is the member of the nation. ... The intention is to guarantee that the nation and the individual are bound to Yahweh alone. Hence "thou shalt have no other gods beside me".'<sup>5</sup>

---

1 Cf. the n. attached here: 'Zimmerli has proved conclusively that the statements about jealousy in Ex. xx. 5 do not refer to the commandment prohibiting images, but refer back beyond this commandment to the first commandment (*Festschrift für A. Bertholet*, pp. 550ff.).'

2 G. VON RAD, *Theology I*, p. 204.

3 *ibid.*, p. 208; cf. n. 41: 'Only in the prophets does the concept of Jahweh's zeal appear in dissociation from the cult and from the reference to the first commandment.'

4 W. GUTBROD, *Law*, p. 25.

5 *ibid.*, p. 26.

Admittedly, GUTBROD does not speak here directly about the 'place in life' we have in mind, namely in the temple cult. Nevertheless his findings are relevant because they are based on his analysis of the 'law' itself and not of its context. In another section, however, he describes the purpose of the 'law' while referring to the temple cult. 'To fulfil the law', he says, 'does not create the relationship to God, but keeps unimpaired the existing one (cf. e.g. II Chron. xxxiii.8).'<sup>1</sup> In the latter text we recognise again the aspect pointed out by R. E. CLEMENTS, namely, the intimate relationship between Temple and land: 'and I will no more remove the feet of Israel from the land ... if only they will be careful to do all that I have commanded them, all the law, ...' (cf. also 2 Kg xxi. 8). Thus, in the second place in life, the point is no more - as in the first - to enter the Temple and to worship God, but to continue to be in God's presence and to dwell on his land.

VON RAD, also without direct reference to the temple cult, actually defines the difference between the first and the second 'place in life' of tamim, when he says, 'The covenant is made, and with it Israel receives the revelation of the commandments. We find the same order even in the late Deuteronomy - Israel has become the people of God ("today you have become the people of Jahweh, your God," Deut. xxvii.9), and to this prediction in the indicative mood is joined the demand to attend to the divine will for justice and to obey it ("listen therefore to the voice of Jahweh, your God," Deut. xxvii. 10).'<sup>2</sup> The order observed, we believe, reflects the basic structure of the temple cult: First, initiation into the presence and communion (covenant) with God; second, revelation of the divine directions in order to 'keep' God's people in His communion (covenant).

Concerning the specific character of torah in the second 'place in life', VON RAD makes the same observation as GUTBROD: 'But for a "law" in the narrower sense of the word, instruction for the moral life, the Decalogue lacks what is of first importance - the positive filling-out, without which a law is scarcely conceivable. Instead, apart from the two well-known exceptions,<sup>3</sup> it refrains from any attempt to set up positive norms for the affairs of life.

---

1 W. GUTBROD, *Law*, p. 40.

2 G. VON RAD, *Theology I*, p. 194.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 191: 'The positive formulation of the commandment concerning parents, and that concerning the sabbath, can certainly be taken as a secondary alteration ...'



It confines itself to a few basic negations; that is, it is content with, as it were, signposts on the margins of a wide sphere of life to which he who belongs to Jahweh has to give heed.<sup>1</sup>

By now it has become clear that our supposition that the first commandment of the Decalogue Ex xx. 2ff. par., 'You shall have no other gods before me', is the negative form - and thus the form appropriate to the second 'place in life' of 'perfection' - of the first positive condition of the Decalogue of Ps xv, 'He who walks perfectly', i.e. wholly consecrated to God, is justified. Especially if we remember the statement in 1 Kg xi. 4, which contains the expression 'his (sc. Solomon's) wives turned away his heart after other gods' parallel to 'his heart was not wholly consecrated to the Lord his God', and thus links the two expressions together.

But, should the relationship between the first condition and the first commandment still be in doubt, we have a last resort. The term *tamim* is also found in the second 'place in life', and that in connection with the king, namely in Ps ci. The formal and material relationship between Pss ci and xv has been recognised, for example, by C. EDLUND<sup>2</sup> and J. L. KOOLE.<sup>3</sup> Whereas Ps xv - as said already at the end of our previous section - more likely is an entrance-liturgy' for all members of the festal procession, including the king, Ps ci generally is held to be a royal liturgy.

MOWINCKEL says about the 'place in life' of Ps ci, 'It can hardly be anything else than the religious cultic part of the enthronement of the king, in connexion with the ceremonies of anointing, and in that case, before the proclamation to the vassals in Ps. 2. As we have seen above ... , there is every reason to presume that the official festival of anointing, at any rate in the later monarchy, would take place in connexion with the new year festival, and that it would be commemorated as an annual festival day in connexion with the latter. No doubt the pattern from the Babylonian enthronement festival has had its influence here, directly or indirectly.'<sup>4</sup>

---

1 G. VON RAD, *Theology I*, p. 194.

2 C. EDLUND, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

3 J. L. KOOLE, *art. cit.* p. 107/08.

4 S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 66.

What is the vital point of 'the psalms of promise', Ps ci? MOWINCKEL answers, 'the king on his festal day is confronted not only by the promises of Yahweh but also by the religious and moral pre-conditions of such a promise: the promise is dependent on his submission to the commandments and laws of Yahweh.' It is correct that there are some references to the 'conditions' in Ps xv - but there is in this psalm, as far as we can see, no question of the king's submission to commandments and laws. Recalling Ps ii.7 we may define the purpose of Ps ci as follows: the king pledges himself to continue 'in the perfection of his heart', and this implies in his case, to continue in his filial relation with Yahweh. Admittedly, the expression 'son of God' does not occur in this psalm. However, there are some expressions which suggest that the king is speaking here not only as the representative of the people before God, i.e. as 'servant', but also as the representative of God before the people, i.e. as 'son'.

We quote here the whole Ps ci, and note the allusions to Ps xv:<sup>1</sup>

- (1) I will sing of loyalty (hesed) and of justice (mishpat);  
to thee, O Yahweh, I will sing.
- (2) I will give heed to the way that is wholly consecrated (tamim). (cf. Ps xv. 2a)  
O when wilt thou come to me?  
I will walk in the integrity of my heart (b<sup>e</sup> tam-l<sup>e</sup> bhabhi) (cf. Ps xv. 2b)  
within my house;
- (3) I will not set before my eyes  
anything that is base.  
I hate the work of those who fall away;  
it shall not cleave to me.
- (4) Perverseness of heart shall be far from me; (cf. Ps xv. 4a)  
I will know nothing of evil. (cf. Ps xv. 3b)
- (5) Him who slanders his neighbor secretly  
I will destroy.  
The man of haughty looks and arrogant heart  
I will not endure.
- (6) I will look with favor on the faithful in the land (cf. ps xv. 4b)  
that they may dwell with me;

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. L. KOOLE, op. cit., p. 108.

He who walks in the way that is wholly consecrated (tamim) (cf. Ps xv. 2a)  
shall minister to me (<sup>e</sup>y shartheni).

(7) No man who practices deceit shall dwell in my house; (cf. Ps xv. 5a)  
no man who utters lies shall continue in my presence (<sup>e</sup>l' neged 'enai).

(8) Morning by morning I will destroy all the wicked in the land,  
cutting off all the evildoers from the city of Yahweh. (cf. Ps xv. 3b)

As a matter of form, this psalm is quite unique in the Old Testament. It starts as a hymn of the anointed to Yahweh (vs. 1). This verse agrees, MOWINCKEL says, 'with the fundamental idea of Israelite religion, that the king is conscious of receiving the "rightness" and "goodwill" needed in his high office, and of having to learn it from Yahweh, as we are told in Ps. 72.1; it is something for which the king must ask God: (vs. 2)'<sup>1</sup> MOWINCKEL understands the bicolon 2a as a question:

May I get insight in the perfect way -  
when wilt thou come to me?<sup>2</sup>

Over against this, C. A. BRIGGS holds these two lines together with vs. 1 to be 'a gloss of worship and prayer for the divine presence.'<sup>3</sup> The same author defines the expression 'in a way of integrity' by 'a course of life which is in complete and entire accord with the divine will', while he calls the following expression 'when wilt thou come unto me' 'a petition for the divine presence as prepared for by entire conformity to His will.'<sup>4</sup> If this interpretation of vs. 2a is correct, this verse is not in accordance with the 'second' 'place in life', for at this stage of the liturgy the epiphany of Yahweh as King is presupposed. In fact, this links up with BRIGGS's suggestion that Ps ci. 2a is a gloss. In this case, we may even say that it confirms the 'place in life' of the main-body of this psalm, for it points to the first part of the Temple liturgy, namely, to the first condition of admittance (2a, first line, cf. Ps xv. 2a), and to the cultic theophany, i.e. Yahweh's coming (2a, second line). Ps ci. 1, we believe, more likely is authentic and to be understood in MOWINCKEL's sense.

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 67/68.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 68.

3 C. A. BRIGGS and E. G. BRIGGS, The Book of Psalms, Vol II (ICC), Edinburgh 1925, p. 314.

4 *ibid.*, p. 314.



We may assume, then, that the verses 2bff. originally immediately followed on vs. 1, the hymnal opening. Although some of the references to Ps xv may not be very distinctive, the correspondance of the two psalms on the whole is unmistakeable. And it is reasonable to think that they were used together as part of the liturgy of the enthronement festival. The exact 'place' of Ps ci perhaps was the moment after the enthronement-oracle (cf. Ps ii. 7) was read by a cult prophet. This is to say, Ps ci seems to be the king's reply to his initiation into filial relationship with Yahweh.

This is suggested also by the way the king speaks. On the one hand, he speaks in the 'name' of the people: he pledges himself to 'walk in the integrity of my heart' not as an individual but as a representative, i.e. 'within my house' (vs. 2b). On the other hand, the following expressions suggest that he speaks as Yahweh 'in Person', or, as 'son of God': 'that they may dwell with Me', 'shall minister to Me' (vs. 6); 'shall dwell in My House', 'shall continue in My Presence' (My Eyes)' (vs. 7); 'I will destroy all the wicked in the land, cutting off all the evil-doers from the city of YAHWEH' (vs. 8). These expressions are the more striking as they are uttered in the Temple, i.e. in Yahweh's dwelling-place, in the place of His Presence.

For the meaning of 'perfection' in this context, and as a confirmation of our assumption that the king is speaking in the 'name' of Yahweh, verse 6b is of special importance:

He who walks in the way that is wholly consecrated (namely, to Yahweh),  
shall minister to Me (namely, <sup>7</sup>et YHWH, or, <sup>b</sup>shem YHWH).<sup>1</sup>

That the second line refers to worship in the Temple is suggested also by the fact that 6a speaks, indirectly but nevertheless clearly, about the dwelling of the faithful in the land. It is worth noting that the synonymous expressions for 'perfection' in 6b and 2b (cf. 2a) are applied respectively to the worshipper and to the king. The meaning of perfection in these instances, in accordance with its 'place in life', is to continue in the communion with God, or, in the case of the king, in his filial relation with God.

MOWINCKEL certainly is right in saying, 'Such was the ideal; according to the Yahweh religion the king ought to be like this. That every-day reality was very often quite

---

<sup>1</sup> Admittedly, the reference of the verb *sharat* is to the king in 1 Chr xxvii. 1, xxviii. 1, 2 Chr xvii. 19, and xxii. 8. However, this verb more frequently refers to cultic service, and in a cult psalm this would be the logical reference, although the direct ref. to Yahweh is missing.

different can be seen both in the speeches of the prophets and in many of the historical records.<sup>1</sup> Over against the contemporary king in the later monarchy, and especially in the midst of the 'tension between North and South which led to the division of the nation into Judah and Israel',<sup>2</sup> the 'image' of David rose high:

He chose David his servant  
and took him from the sheepfolds;  
from tending the ewes that had young  
he brought him to be the shepherd of Jacob his people,  
of Israel his inheritance.  
With a perfect heart (k<sup>e</sup> tom l<sup>e</sup> bhabho) he tended them,  
and guided them with skilful hand. (Ps lxxviii. 70-72)

To sum up this section: On the whole we may assume that, when the 'entrance-liturgy' contained a list of basic conditions (cf. Ps xv), it was sufficient in the second part of the liturgy, i.e. in the second 'place in life', to summarize the basic commandments in accordance with the previous conditions. In this sense we may understand Ps lxxxi, which refers to God's ways as something which already is known (vs. 13). The conditions pointed out that what is meant is the 'way of perfection', i.e. of entire consecration to the Deity (cf. Ps xv. 2a). Or, it was even sufficient to proclaim a divine warning to hear and obey in the second part (cf. Ps xciv. 7b; and Ps 1.7, although here exhortations follow).

On the other hand, when in Deuteronomic times the Decalogue Ex xx. 2ff. par. came to be used regularly in the second part of the liturgy, the 'entrance-liturgy' presumably would have been short, such as Ps xxiv. 3-6. Yet, as far as our evidence goes, the positive demand of 'perfection', a consecrated way of life or a consecrated, pure heart, always was essential. In later times, the emphasis seems to have been more on the second part of the liturgy, on 'law'. We may again quote W. GUTBROD, who says about the post-exilic period: 'Yet in fact the emphasis and passion are directed more and more to the second proposition that everything depends on the people's fulfilling the law. The transition to the later conception of the law according to which the relationship to God is first created by it is often not hard and fast. The law acquires an ever

---

1 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 63.

2 OAB, ad Ps lxxviii. 67-72; on the relationship between North and South and their respective interpretations of the covenant see: M. L. NEWMAN, The People of the Covenant, A Study of Israel from Moses to the Monarchy, New York - Nashville 1962.

increasing independent importance, acquires a primary significance for the relationship to God. Besides the praise of what God did for their forefathers, the praise of the law for itself gains ever greater prominence (cf. too the two parts of Ps. xix) as being the God-given means for the nation by which it maintains itself in his favour.<sup>1</sup>

For this later development Ps cxix, which perhaps is 'a purely literary exercise in honor of the written law',<sup>2</sup> is a good illustration. In this huge and highly artificial psalm, which contains not less than eight different terms for the 'law', the term *tamim* also occurs. We quote here the two relevant passages, in order to see whether or not there is a difference in meaning over against its use in the cult psalms:

- (1) Blessed are the perfect of way (th<sup>e</sup> mimey-dharekh),  
who walk in the law (b<sup>e</sup> thorath) of the Lord!
- (2) Blessed are those who keep his testimonies (‘edhothaw),  
who seek him with their whole heart,
- (3) who also do no wrong,  
but walk in his ways.
- (79) Let those who fear thee turn to me,  
that they may know thy testimonies.
- (80) May my heart be wholly (thamim) in thy statutes,  
that I may not be put to shame!
- (81) My soul languishes for thy salvation;  
I hope in thy word (lith<sup>e</sup> bharkha).

Recalling the cultic concept of perfection, we note that the present concept is slightly 'out of focus': the heart of the psalmist, instead of being 'wholly consecrated' to Yahweh Himself, is wholly in his Statutes. It is not surprising, therefore, that immediately afterwards the hope is 'in thy Word.' This is in accordance with the new quality, absent in the cultic context, that the law had obtained by now, namely 'preexistence':<sup>3</sup>

- (89) For ever, O Lord, thy word (d<sup>e</sup> bharka)  
is firmly fixed in the heavens.

---

1 W. GUTBROD, *Law*, p. 40.

2 OAB, ad loc.

3 Cf. C. A. BRIGGS, *Psalms II*, p. 429.



The beginning of Ps cxix displays the same tendency: the 'perfect of way' are those who 'walk in the law of the Lord'. The emphasis is no more on a 'cultic' relationship with God, on continuing in His communion (covenant), but on 'keeping' his testimonies (vs. 2). 'This verb', BRIGGS says, 'is frequently used in this Ps.: with Testimonies also v. 22.129, with Law v. 34, with Precepts v. 56.69.100, with Commands v. 115, with Statutes v. 33.145.'<sup>1</sup>

An apt conclusion both to the present and the previous chapter about the 'presupposition' of the Sermon on the Mount is the following statement by MOWINCKEL, which links the end and the beginning of the temple cult together: 'And as long as the Temple existed the festal service would end in the all-embracing blessing of the priest on the congregation in the well-known words:

May Yahweh bless you and protect you!

May Yahweh make his face shine upon you and favour you!

May Yahweh lift up his eyes upon you and give you peace!

And it is explicitly said that "when the priests thus put my name on the sons of Israel, I will bless them" (Num. 6.22ff.) - at the same time an evidence of what was said above, that it is Yahweh who adds the power of his blessing to the words, making them effectual. Nor is it to be interpreted differently, when the priests say: "We bless you with the name of Yahweh" (Ps. 118.26).<sup>2</sup>

According to our hypothesis, the structure of the Temple cult between the two blessings, which mark the admittance to the sanctuary and the end of its service, is the 'presupposition' of the Sermon on the Mount. We have arrived at the conclusion that the basic structure of the Temple cult in ancient Israel consisted of two parts, which we may define as follows:

- (1) Initiation into the presence and communion with God;
- (2) Exhortations to continue the communion with God.

We now recognise the same basic structure of what we believe to be the authentic 'Sermon' of the historical Jesus, namely: (1) Beatitudes; (2) Antithesis. These two parts will be discussed separately, and that - in accordance with our subject - under the headings: (VII) The Realisation of Perfection, and (VIII) The Way of Perfection.

---

1 C. A. BRIGGS, Psalms II, p. 419.

2 S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms II, p. 47.

THE 'PLACE IN LIFE' AND THE  
MEANING OF PERFECTION  
IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

1 The evidence of an inter-Testamental  
religious community

The symbol of the two centuries between the Old and the New Testament has for long been the 'single blank page' separating Malachi from Matthew.<sup>1</sup> But by now, the texts, discoveries and studies relating to this period have risen to a flood which, at first glance, seems to divide the Old from the New Testament even more severely than the 'single blank page' of former days. In this chapter, therefore, attempt is made neither to review the many streams of theological thought current in the inter-Testamental period, nor to build a bridge which links the two banks. When publication of the Hebrew text of the Scrolls began in April 1950, there was a tendency to jump to conclusions about their relation to the New Testament, without paying enough attention to their Old Testament background.<sup>2</sup> Some of the more extreme positions have been abandoned in the meantime, but the interpretation of the Scrolls remains difficult, especially because the long history and development of the religious experience reflected in them has not yet been clarified sufficiently. Hence we have to be very cautious with our interpretation and may not expect to find in the Scrolls a systematic theology. The time has not yet come to reach a definite conclusion about the theological and historical relation between the Old Testament and

---

1 Cf. D. S. RUSSELL, Between the Testaments, London 1960, p. 11.

2 See e.g., JEAN CARMAIGNAC, Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness, The Evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls (ET), Baltimore-Dublin 1962. The scholar with whom CARMAIGNAC finds himself in disagreement is above all ANDRE DUPONT-SOMMER. Cf. also GERT JEREMIAS, Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit, Göttingen 1962.

the Dead Sea Scrolls on the one hand, and the Scrolls and the New Testament on the other hand. The present investigation aspires only to be a small contribution to the clarification of these relations, and it will be directed entirely by its subject, i.e., the concept of perfection. If we regard the Scrolls from this point of view, a red thread leaps to our eyes which leads from 'perfection' in the Old to 'perfection' in the New Testament, or, we believe, more especially to Mt v. 48, namely the adjective *tamim* and the noun *tom/tam* which are found frequently in the Scrolls.<sup>1</sup>

This observation, of course, is not new. As far as we can see, B. RIGAUX was first to describe it.<sup>2</sup> 'There is no doubt', he says, 'about the fundamental significance of *tamim* in the Old Testament. The adjective means "complete", "integer", "entire". One applies it to sacrificial animals in the sense of "without fault"; if it determines God and men, it takes on the meaning of "perfect". "The Rock, his work is perfect", Dt xxxii. 4. "The law of Yahweh is perfect", Ps xix. 8. His knowledge is perfect, Job xxxvi. 4; xxxvii. 16. Applied to persons, the word can mean "innocent" and "without fault", Ps cxix. 80. The adjective is often linked to the noun *derek*, the way.' (E.g. 2 Sam xxii. 31 = Ps xviii. 33; Ps ci. 6, cf. cxix. 1; Prov xi. 20)<sup>3</sup>

'There is thus no doubt', RIGAUX proceeds, 'that the monks of Qumran derived their terminology about perfection from the Old Testament. Furthermore, it does not seem to be doubtful either that it is through the expression "perfect way" that *thm* and *thmim* entered the vocabulary of Qumran.'<sup>4</sup> Finally, RIGAUX arrives at the following conclusion: 'To sum up, we have found in the constituents of perfection according to Qumran a moral element, the obedience and the walking in the way, a mystical element, this is to say one which surpasses the human categories of knowledge, of will and acts, the purification through and the gift of the holy Spirit, finally a gnostic element, the knowledge of God's plan and God's law, which reaches its goal

---

1 Cf. K. G. KUHN (Ed.), *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten*, Göttingen 1960, pp. 234 and 231; the verb *tmn* is also found, cf. *ibid.*, p. 234.

2 Cf. B. RIGAUX, *Perfection* (art.cit.), in: *NTS*, Vol.IV, 1957-58, pp. 237ff.

3 *ibid.*, p. 237/38.

4 *ibid.*, p. 238.



in a revelation of God's activity and of the eternal destinies of man. The holy Spirit is the mediator of the knowledge of the mysteries.<sup>1</sup>

It is quite clear that RIGAUX's findings about perfection in the Scrolls to a great extent depend on his understanding of the concept of perfection in the Old Testament. As our view presented in the previous chapter differs considerably from his in this respect, we cannot follow him in his interpretation of perfection in the Scrolls either. Therefore, we have to choose another approach to this concept.

We are lucky in that the point of departure which suggested itself for a cultic understanding of the Sermon on the Mount is found also in the Dead Sea Scrolls, namely Is x1.3. We quote here the relevant passage, 1 QS viii. 14-16:<sup>2</sup> 'And when these become members of the Community in Israel according to all these rules, they shall separate from the habitation of ungodly men and shall go into the wilderness to prepare the way of Him; as it is written, "Prepare in the wilderness the way of ... make straight in the desert a path for our God (Isa. x1.3). This (path) is the study of the Law which He commanded by the hand of Moses, that they may do according to all that has been revealed from age to age, and as the Prophets have revealed by His Holy Spirit.'

MATTHEW BLACK says in this connection, 'The place of prophetic next to Mosaic revelation is characteristic for Qumran: their basic idea of revelation, with reference to both its main sources, Torah and Prophets, is one of progressive disclosure to the sect of the revealed will of God from Holy Scripture. This is the function of the priestly teachers, the Bene Zadock, in the

---

1 B. RIGAUX, *ibid.*, p. 240/41; cf. M. BLACK, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, *Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament*, London 1961, p. 119/20: 'The claim here made (sc. by RIGAUX, *cit.*) that Qumran Perfectionism included "the purification and gift of the Holy Spirit" seems to me to be a misunderstanding of 1 QS; the Qumran saints were looking forward, at a future time of divine visitation, to such a "purification" (nowhere, however, described as a "gift"). The most that can be said is that the "perfection of way" of these sectarians was related to the measure of their purification by the divinely created "spirit of truth", which is, however, no more than a general expression to describe the fundamental basis of Qumran "Perfection of Way", namely, its absolute and total obedience to the "divinely revealed tradition of the Law handed down and developed by the sect." This comprises the moral element (though the revealed Law includes juridical, ceremonial, and other elements as well). It is this divinely imparted revelation of the Law (and, as we shall see, of the Prophets too) which constitutes the esoteric "gnosis" or "mysteries" of Qumran.'

2 All quotation from the Scrolls in this chapter are given in the trans. of G. VERMES, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, (Penguin Books) Harmondsworth 1961.

Community: (1 QS v. 8ff.).<sup>1</sup> The fact that both Torah and the Prophets - and, to a lesser degree, apocalyptic writings - are central issues of the Sect suggests that the place and meaning of law at Qumran requires careful study. Are we really right in defining the concept of perfection contained in the Scrolls by 'legalistic perfection'?<sup>2</sup> We venture to say: as far as we can see, the thought of Qumran is not torah-centric in the absolute sense as that of other forms of later Judaism.<sup>3</sup>

The heading of the new section in the Community Rule immediately after the quotation of Is x1.3, i.e. 'And these are the rules which the men of perfect holiness (nsy htmym qwds) shall follow in their commerce with one another' (1 QS viii. 20), suggests that the expression 'they shall separate from the habitation of the ungodly men' refers to the concept of holiness. If this is correct, we may assume that the - as we have seen above: secondary<sup>4</sup> - aspect of 'separation' is predominant in the Scrolls. Moreover, this expression is to be understood as an interpretation of the following quotation of Is x 1.3. What does this mean for the self-understanding of Qumran?

Qumran, or, to be more exact, the Council of the Community, regarded itself as 'a House of Holiness for Israel' (byt qwds lysr'1, 1 QS viii. 5), or even as 'a Holy of Holies for Aaron' (qwds qwdsym l' hrwn, 1 QS viii. 5, 8; ix. 6), or simply as 'a foundation of the Building of Holiness' (wswd mbnyt qwds, 1 QS xi. 8), all of which expressions refer to the Temple.<sup>5</sup> In view of Mt v. 14 it is worth noting that the noun used for 'Building' in 1 QS xi. 8, i.e. mbnyt, occurs also in Ezek xl.2: '... and brought me in the visions of God into the land of Israel, and set me down upon a very high mountain, on which was a structure (mibh<sup>e</sup> neh, the masc. form) like a city opposite me.' In the context of Ezek xl, the reference is to the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple. The context of 1 QS xi. 8 reads as follows:

He (sc. God) has joined their assembly  
to the Sons of Heaven

---

1 M. BLACK, Scrolls, p. 120.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 122.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 118.

4 See above p. 133.

5 On the designation of the Community as 'Sanctuary' see HANS KOSMALA, Hebräer - Essener - Christen, Studien zur Vorgeschichte der frühchristlichen Verkündigung, Leiden 1959, pp. 363ff.



to be a Council of the Community,  
 a foundation of the Building of Holiness,  
 an eternal Plantation throughout all ages to come.<sup>1</sup>

What is the idea of the Council of the Community being a 'foundation' of the Temple?  
 We may think here of the important concept of the 'remnant', which the Sect took over from  
 Isaiah:

(for) in a little while I know,  
 Thou wilt raise up survivors among Thy people  
 and a remnant within Thine inheritance.  
 Thou wilt purify and cleanse them of their sin  
 for all their deeds are in Thy truth. ...  
 and Thou wilt establish them in Thy Council  
 according to the uprightness of Thy truth. (1 QH vi. 7-9, 10)<sup>2</sup>

With this passage we may compare Is xxxvii. 31-32:

And a surviving remnant of the house of Judah  
 shall again take root downward,  
 and bear fruit upward;  
 for out of Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant,  
 and out of Mount Zion a band of survivors.  
 The zeal of the Lord of hosts will accomplish this.

In what was the Qumran-remnant different from the majority of the people of Israel?  
 Why did the covenanters go forth from Mount Zion to build a new 'House' and to plant a new  
 'Plantation' in the wilderness of wadi Qumran? The answer to these questions is stated clearly in  
 1 QpHab xii. 6bf.: 'And as for that which He said, "Because of the blood of the city and the  
 violence done to the land"; interpreted, "the city" is Jerusalem where the Wicked Priest com-  
 mitted abominable deeds and defiled the Temple of God.'<sup>3</sup>

In this connection we may quote the following passage about, so to speak, 'Qumran and  
 the Temple', by G. VERMES: 'As regards the offering of sacrifice, Jewish law held that this  
 essential form of worship was valid only in the Temple of Jerusalem. But the Scrolls demonstrate

---

1 G. VERMES, Scrolls, p. 93.

2 *ibid.*, p. 169.

3 *ibid.*, p. 240.



that the Community regarded the Priests officiating in the sanctuary as wicked, the Temple itself profaned by uncleanness, and the orthodox liturgical calendar unlawful. The sect was consequently faced with a dilemma which they appear to have solved in the following way:

(1) Sacrificial worship as such was not to be condemned despite the abuses of the wicked priesthood, but the Community's Priests and Levites must in no circumstances actively participate in Temple services (DR VI). The sectaries were nevertheless able to send their offerings to Jerusalem provided they were carried there by a person in a state of ritual purity, and that they were not placed on the altar on the Sabbath day (DR XI). (2) As soon as the Community conquered Jerusalem, Temple worship would be reorganized in conformity with the divine statutes relating to it. This event was expected to take place in the seventh year of the final forty years' war of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness (WR II). (3) In the meantime, the Council of the Community represented and fulfilled the role of sanctuary. Atonement was to be made by means of prayer, through the "offering of the lips", "perfection of way", and acceptance of suffering (CR VIII-IX; Midrash on the Last Days I).<sup>1</sup>

The points made here by VERMES could be supported by many quotations from the books of other Qumran-specialists. But this is hardly necessary for our purpose. No one would wish to deny that the Temple plays a very important role in the Scrolls, and that both the Temple of Jerusalem and the 'Spiritual Temple', i.e. the Council of the Community. HANS KOSMALA says concerning the latter, 'When the sect describes her community as 'a House of Holiness' (qodeš etc., miqdaš), thus in a word which made everyone think of the Temple, she gave to this word a new meaning while keeping the characteristic part of the original content: the Sanctuary is God's dwelling-place and as such filled with His presence.'<sup>2</sup>

If KOSMALA is right in saying that the Sect believed God to be present in her Council, this is of utmost importance for her understanding of 'perfection'. For in this case, we may assume that tamim denotes the relation of the worshipper to God, as we found in the cult psalms of the Old Testament, and in some other texts which reflect a cultic background. Moreover,

---

1 G. VERMES, *Scrolls*, p. 45/46.

2 H. KOSMALA, *op. cit.*, p. 372/73.

whereas in the Old Testament the cultic meaning of tamim, i.e. 'wholly consecrated', can be derived from the origin of tamim and its relation to qadhosh only, 'perfection' and 'offering' are directly linked in the Scrolls, e.g., in 1 QS ix. 5: 'And prayer rightly offered shall be as an acceptable fragrance of righteousness, and perfection of way as a delectable free-will offering'.<sup>1</sup> As the animal used for a free-will offering must be tamim (cf. Lev xxii. 17-20), there is no doubt that here again the condition laid down for the sacrificial animal is reapplied to the worshipper himself. Hence we may assume that it is from the cultic and relational concept of perfection found in the Old Testament that the Community derived her terminology about perfection. In this case, it may mean neither 'innocent', 'without fault' (RIGAUX) nor 'absolute and total obedience' (BLACK, cf. RIGAUX) but most probably 'wholly consecrated'.

With the findings of the brief discussion of the present section and our hypothesis about the Sermon on the Mount in mind, we venture to frame the following twofold hypothesis:

- (1) The outlook of Qumran, as evident in the Dead Sea Scrolls, to a great extent is hiero-centric.<sup>2</sup>
- (2) The character of the concept of perfection found in the Scrolls is cultic and relational.<sup>3</sup>

We now proceed to test this hypothesis, while distinguishing again a twofold 'place in life' of tamim and its derivatives.

---

1 G. VERMES, *Scrolls*, p. 87.

2 Cf. SVEND HOLM-NIELSEN, *Hodayot*, Psalms from Qumran, Aarhus 1960, p. 341/42; where he says in his discussion about the 'place in life' of the Hodayot: 'It is possible to consider that the form of worship was based upon the example of the worship in the Temple, so far as was possible under the existing circumstances; it is not even impossible that there were similar corresponding cultic ceremonies, purifications, festivals of thanksgiving, rituals of penance, inauguration rites, rites in connection with sickness, etc., all without that which originally was the main part, the sacrifice itself. In such a case, it is natural to assume that they were associated with special liturgy, and is not unthinkable that some of the Hodayot were used on such occasions.'

3 S. HOLM-NIELSEN, *ibid.*, p. 342, does not want to go so far as to regard the terminology of the Hodayot on the whole as 'cultic', 'Until one is able to obtain further light upon the religious life and interpretation of cult within the Qumran community, ...'. In our following section we try to throw some new light on the ritual about which there is some direct evidence in the Scrolls, namely 'initiation', in which the term tamim seems to play an important role.

## 2 Perfection in the context of initiation

A most important statement about the initiation of new members into the community of Qumran is contained in the dissertation of S. HOLM-NIELSEN: 'That which especially points to the reference (sc. in 1 QS i, ii; v. 8ff. and 1 QM xiii. 1ff.) being to a cultic ceremony is the fact that the expression, "enter into the covenant in the presence of God" (1 QS 1: 16), is used. One may well assert that this expression should be understood in the figurative sense, but it cannot really be denied that it has its origin in cultic language of admission to the holy place and the use of the expression alone is sufficient to point to the associated ceremony being holy in its character.'<sup>1</sup> If the author is right in drawing this conclusion from the previous statement, the concept of initiation discussed above<sup>2</sup> would be the immediate background to the initiation ceremony at Qumran: 'Moreover, it appears from 1 QS 2:19, that this is not just something which takes place occasionally but that the ceremony is intended to take place year after year as long as the world stands ("throughout all the days of the rule of Belial"). It is obvious thus that there was a yearly celebration within the community of a feast for the renewal of the covenant, and it is reasonable to assume that the initiation of new members occurred at this annual feast, and that such initiation ceremonies were not held on chance occasions throughout the year when the occasion presented itself. It is in itself a natural thought that this feast, which was celebrated thus in Qumran, is in fact the feast of the New Year, which may have been linked within the community to the community's own history on the basis of the opinion that it was this very community which was the new Israel.'<sup>3</sup>

Other scholars, however, mention a different feast. 'The ceremony of initiation ("entering the Covenant")', J. T. MILIK says, 'probably took place once a year, at Pentecost, which was for the Essenes the feast of the renewal of the Covenant.'<sup>4</sup> We note that the two opinions agree in that they hold the ceremony of initiation to be celebrated together with the

---

1 S. HOLM-NIELSEN, Hodayot, p. 344.

2 See above p. 76ff.

3 S. HOLM-NIELSEN, *ibid.*, p. 344.

4 J. T. MILIK, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea (ET) London 1959, p. 103; so also G. VERMES, Scrolls, p. 31, and M. BLACK, Scrolls, p. 92.



renewal of the covenant. As in ancient Israel the renewal of the covenant most probably was part of the most important festival of the year, namely the 'feast of Tabernacles', the old festival of harvest and new year (cf. Dt xxxi. 10f.), and - probably - in orthodox Judaism this was still so in post-exilic times<sup>1</sup>, the new date must be of some significance.

J. T. MILIK offers the following explanation: 'In the Old Testament, no precise date is given for the arrival at Sinai and Moses' ascent of the mountain. Ex 19. 1 (P<sup>2</sup>) only says: "In the third month after their departure from the land of Egypt, on this day (sic!) the children of Israel came to the desert of Sinai ... and Moses went up the mountain to God." Later Jewish tradition was divided, some placing this event on the first of the month, but the majority on the Feast of Weeks. My Samaritan informants tell me that they believe that the revelation on Mount Sinai took place at the Feast of Pentecost. As far as the Essenes are concerned the evidence is quite clear. Our oldest manuscript of the Damascus Document places the ceremony of the renewal of the covenant in the third month of the year.'<sup>3</sup>

In the question of dating, J. T. MILIK seems to be right. Nevertheless, S. HOLM-NIELSEN observed a very important fact, namely, that the language used in the ceremony of initiation - to a certain extent - is borrowed from 'the cultic language of admission to the holy place', or, in other words, from the 'entrance-liturgies'. The occurrence of the concept of 'perfection' in this context within the Scrolls - to the discussion of which we presently shall proceed - confirms this thesis.

First, however, we must add another observation. When the renewal of the covenant was brought over from the New Year Festival to the Feast of Pentecost, the concept of the kingship of Yahweh was left in the old context.<sup>4</sup> At the same time the universalistic aspect,

---

1 See E. KUTSCH, art. *Feste II*. In Israel, in: *RGG II*, col. 912: 'In orthodox Judaism, however, the Feast of Weeks does not seem to have held yet such an important position; no treatise about this is transmitted. Only in the 2nd century A.D. it became the feast of the revelation and of the promulgation of the law at Sinai, which it has remained until today.'

2 Cf. E. KUTSCH, *ibid.*

3 J. T. MILIK, *Discovery*, p. 117.

4 Cf. A. GUILDING, *op. cit.*, p. 86; (cf. above p. 124 ).

which was attached to the renewal of the covenant in connection with the Enthronement<sup>1</sup>, was lost, and the covenant came to be limited exclusively to Israel.<sup>2</sup>

Secondly, it must be admitted that our knowledge of the ceremonies of initiation at Qumran still is far from being complete. The primary sources are the Community Rule (1 QS) and JOSEPHUS' Excursus about the 'Jewish Sects'<sup>3</sup>, from which it is evident that in fact there were three different stages of initiation, viz. into the postulancy, the novitiate, and full membership.<sup>4</sup> The significance of the first stage is still disputed. J. T. MILIK believes that during this time of one year, the 'postulants' 'were free to leave at any time'<sup>5</sup>. G. VERMES, however, says, 'In my view, there is little justification for this theory. With his "binding oath" a man took on himself, once and for all, the sacred obligation to accept the teaching of the sons of Zadok and to abide by their Rule.'<sup>6</sup> If this view is right, the two other initiations were a matter of 'advancement'. 'Once more, initiation demanded a preliminary examination to ascertain the candidate's worthiness and ability, and if the Council found them adequate he had to take instruction for another two years, submitting himself to further public scrutiny at the end of each one. ... In the second year, provided he had satisfied his examiners, he handed over all his possessions to the Bursar who put them aside until his training was complete. He was admitted to the refectory, but was still not allowed to participate in the Meals reserved to the fully initiated. ... If, at the end of all this, he was judged worthy by the Council, he was then solemnly admitted to full membership.'<sup>7</sup> Finally, we may add another quotation: 'The "Manual of Discipline" and unpublished fragments of the "Damascus Document" suggest that the main features of the ceremony were the taking of vows and the pronouncing of liturgical formulae of blessing and cursing.'<sup>8</sup>

---

1 See above p. 100.

2 In this, the DSS seem to be influenced by the Priestly writer (P); cf. the theological tendency of P described by G. FOHRER, art. Priesterschrift, in: RGV V, col. 596.

3 Cf. J. T. MILIK, Discovery, p. 101, esp. n. 3: 1 QS VI. 13-23 (likewise V. 1ff., VII. 18-21); cf. War II. viii. 137-9. (We use JOSEPHUS, The Jewish War, translated by G. A. WILLIAMSON, The Penguin Classics, 1960; cf. pp. 371ff.)

4 The terms are from J. T. MILIK, *ibid.*, p. 102.

5 See *ibid.*

6 G. VERMES, Scrolls, p. 26.

7 *ibid.*, p. 27.

8 J. T. MILIK, Discovery, p. 103; see also the monograph by MANFRED WEISE, Kultzeiten und kultischer Bundesschluss in der "Ordensregel" vom Toten Meer, Leiden 1961.



Before we discuss the liturgy of the ceremony of initiation at Qumran, we have to learn more about the concept of perfection found in the Scrolls. P. J. DU PLESSIS says about the 'Essential qualities of teleios' in these documents, 'Unlike the O. T. its predominant cultic and quantitative sense is absent here.'<sup>1</sup> He is, of course, right if by the expression 'cultic' (sense) he refers to tamim as a terminus technicus for sacrificial animals. If we take the word 'cultic' in a wider sense, however, this statement needs qualification.

In connection with 1 QS ix. 5 - to which we already referred at the end of our previous section - H. KOSMALA and, before him, W. H. BROWNLEE, made an interesting observation. We quote here 1 QS ix. 4-5: 'They (sc. the fully initiated) shall atone for guilty rebellion and for sins of unfaithfulness that they may obtain loving kindness for the Land without the flesh of holocausts and the fat of sacrifice. And prayer rightly offered shall be as an acceptable fragrance of righteousness, and perfection of way (wtmym drk) as a delectable free-will offering (kndbt mnhit rawn).'<sup>2</sup>

The two scholars suggest that it is from the expression 'free-will offering' we have to understand the curious self-designation of the Community, i.e. hmtndbyrn ('hammit-nadd<sup>e</sup>birn'). We quote here the first instance where it occurs, namely 1 QS v. 1 (cf. also v. 6, 8, 10, 21, 22; vi. 13): 'And this is the Rule for the men of the Community "who have freely pledged themselves" to be converted from all evil and to cling to all His commandments according to His will.'<sup>3</sup> KOSMALA concludes from this statement: 'They are the people of Israel who devote (= sacrifice) themselves of their own free will.'<sup>4</sup>

This explanation strongly supports our own hypothesis that the Community understood tamim in a cultic sense, i.e. 'wholly consecrated'. Thus we may paraphrase the decisive passage as follows: 'and a wholly consecrated way of life (shall be acceptable) as a delectable free-will offering'.

We now turn to the liturgy of initiation as contained in the passage 1 QS i. 18b - ii.18.<sup>5</sup> Following MANFRED WEISE, we may reconstruct this liturgy in this way:

---

1 P. J. DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, p. 104.

2 G. VERMES, *Scrolls*, p. 87.

3 *ibid.*, p. 78.

4 H. KOSMALA, *Hebräer*, p. 374.

5 See G. VERMES, *ibid.*, pp. 72-74.



- |      |                      |  |
|------|----------------------|--|
| (1)  | PRIESTS AND LEVITES: | Praise (blessing) of God (i.18b, 19). <sup>1</sup>                                 |
| (2)  | COMMUNITY:           | Amen-response (i. 19b, 20).  |
| (3)  | PRIESTS:             | Recitation of God's merciful grace to Israel (i.21f.).                             |
| (4)  | LEVITES:             | Recitation of the sins of Israel (i.22-24a).                                       |
| (5)a | COMMUNITY:           | Confession of sin (i. 24b-ii.1).   |
|      | b                    | Pledge to 'live perfectly before' God (cf. i. 8)                                   |
| (6)  | PRIESTS:             | Aronic blessing of all initiants who 'walk perfectly in all His ways' (ii. 1b-4a). |
| (7)  | LEVITES:             | Levitic curse of 'all the men of the lot of Satan' (ii. 4b-10).                    |
| (8)  | COMMUNITY:           | Amen-response (10b).   |
| (9)  | PRIESTS AND LEVITES: | Curse of the apostates who walk among the idols of their heart (ii. 11-17).        |
| (10) | COMMUNITY:           | Amen-response (ii. 18).  |

For point (1), WEISE refers to the psalm contained in 1 Chr xvi.<sup>2</sup> This chapter reports a service of dedication apparently in connection with the bringing of the ark to the city of David. It is worth noting that the middle section of the composite psalm in question, 1 Chr xvi. 8ff., namely vss. 23-33, is identical with the Enthronement psalm xcvi. 1-3. However, as mentioned already, in 1 QS the universalistic aspect is absent: There is no question of 'declaring God's glory to the nations' (cf. 1 Chr xvi. 24 // Ps xcvi. 3).

The same feature is found in the following point (2): the favours of God and His merciful grace refer to Israel only. Weise assumes that this point together with (3) is derived from 'liturgical texts' in the Old Testament.<sup>3</sup> The confession of sin in the Community, WEISE explains, corresponds to the confession uttered by the high priest on the Day of Atonement.<sup>4</sup>

If we compare the present liturgy with the 'entrance-liturgies',<sup>5</sup> we recognise the similarity of the pattern. Obviously, the ritual of initiation at Qumran is expanded with materials from other sources, as pointed out by WEISE. Admittedly, WEISE does not refer to the 'entrance-liturgies'. In fact, it is natural to assume that the later example would show some sort of development according to the specific cultic situation at Qumran.

1 See M. WEISE, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 110 (Summary).

3 *ibid.*, p. 111.

4 *ibid.*, p. 111.

5 See above p. 81.

As to the decisive question, namely the occurrence of the concept of perfection in the context of 'initiation', no doubt is possible. In 1 QS ii. 2 to 'walk perfectly in all His ways' (lhwlykm tmyw bkw l drkyw) obviously is intended as the basic condition of acceptance, as in Ps xv. 2a and Josh. xxiv. 14. The fact, that in ii.2 tamim is not explicitly mentioned as a condition, can easily be explained as follows: As the most important point of the liturgy of initiation, the conditions are mentioned before, viz. in i. 7f.: 'He (sc. the Master, i.e. the teacher of the initiants, for whom the Rule seems to have been intended<sup>1</sup>) shall admit into the Covenant of Grace all those who have freely devoted themselves to the observance of God's precepts, that they may be joined to the counsel of God and may live perfectly before Him in accordance with all that has been revealed concerning their appointed times, and that they may love all the sons of light, each according to his lot in God's design, and hate all the sons of darkness, each according to his guilt in God's vengeance.'

The fact that mention is made of 'light' suggests that the Sermon on the Mount and the Dead Sea Scrolls share the same presupposition. The following comparison shows that this term occurs three times in a context of initiation: Ps cxviii. 26, 27a:

Blessed be he who enters in the name of the Lord:

We bless you from the House of the Lord.

The Lord is God,

and has given us light.

1 QS i. 9 (cf. ii. 9; iii. 13, 24, 25; 1 QM i. 1, 3, 9, 11, 13):

(initiants) 'may love all the sons of light ...'

Mt v. 14:

You (initiants) are the light of the world.

As we have seen above<sup>2</sup>, in the cult of the Temple the symbol of light most probably points to the theophany. That the meaning at Qumran is essentially still the same, is evident from 1 QS i.16: 'enter into the covenant in the presence of God'.<sup>3</sup>

1 Cf. G. VERMES, Scrolls, p. 71.

2 See above p. 86.

3 Trans. S. HOLM-NIELSEN, see cit. above p. 183.

We have to mention yet another text which may have been related to the same ceremony. This text is called by THEODOR H. GASTER 'The Hymn of the Initiants'<sup>1</sup>. From this hymn we quote the following passages, in which the term tamim occurs, or which are for other reasons of special interest:

With the coming of day and night  
 I will enter the Covenant of God,  
 and when evening and morning depart  
 I will recite his decrees. (1 QS x.10)  
 As for me,  
 my justification is with God.  
 In His hand are the perfection of my way (twm drky)  
 and the uprightness of my heart.  
 He will wipe out my transgression  
 through His righteousness. (xi. 2-3)  
 As for me,  
 I belong to wicked mankind,  
 to the company of ungodly flesh.  
 My iniquities, rebellions, and sins,  
 together with the perversity of my heart,  
 belong to the company of worms  
 and to those who walk in darkness.  
 For mankind has no way,  
 and man is unable to establish his steps  
 since justification is with God  
 and perfection of way (twm hdk) is out of His hand  
 All things come to pass by His knowledge;  
 He establishes all things by His design  
 and without Him nothing is done. (xi. 9-11)

---

1. TH. H. GASTER, The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect, in English Translation with Introduction and Notes, London 1957, pp. 123ff.; cf. his explanation on p. 120/21: "To the main body of hymns we have here prefixed another, which the ancient librarians of Qumran attached to a copy of the "Manual of Discipline". If one reads it carefully, one will find that it repeats almost verbatim the list of obligations and the basic oath of allegiance laid down in that document for new members of the Brotherhood. It may therefore be regarded as a hymn chanted by initiants when they were formally received into the community; and this would in turn explain why the ancient librarians considered it an appropriate liturgical "appendix" to the "Manual". On this hypothesis we have called it 'The Hymn of the Initiants'. The Scrolls themselves, it may be added, bear no titles; those assigned by modern scholars are therefore in any case quite arbitrary.'



Blessed art Thou, my God,  
 who openest the heart of Thy servant to knowledge :  
 Establish all his deeds in righteousness,  
 and as it pleases Thee to do for the elect of mankind,  
 grant that the son of Thy handmaid  
 may stand before Thee for ever.  
 For without Thee no way is perfect (lw ttm drk),  
 and without Thy will nothing is done.  
 It is Thou who hast taught all knowledge  
 and all things come to pass by Thy will.  
 There is none beside Thee to dispute Thy counsel  
 or to understand all Thy holy design,  
 or to contemplate the depth of Thy mysteries  
 and the power of Thy might. (xi. 15-20)

P. J. DU PLESSIS remarks in his dissertation about 'perfection' in the Scrolls over against the Old Testament: 'First and foremost discrepancy is the fact that every single member of the community was considered tamim by virtue of his inauguration as full member of the sect.'<sup>1</sup> This statement needs qualification in two respects. In a context of initiation, the fact mentioned is the same in the Old Testament. For if 'he who walks perfectly (tamim)' in Ps xv. 2a belongs to an 'entrance-liturgy' - and there is little doubt about this - every single member of the procession which demanded admittance to the sanctuary was supposed to fulfil this condition, and thus to be 'tamim'. On the other hand, it is not quite right to say that 'by virtue of his inauguration', or, initiation, every member is 'perfect', for 'perfection' in this context is a condition which must be fulfilled before the initiation can take place.

We may assume, then, that 'perfection' in this context has basically the same meaning as in the Psalms. Already in 1 QS i. 8 the aspect of relationship is quite clear, and, in accordance with the cultic situation, it is a question of relation to God: '... live perfectly before Him' (wlhthlk lpyw tmym). Thus the condition is also at Qumran to be 'wholly consecrated' to God. Those 'native Israelites'<sup>2</sup> who pledged to do this were admitted in the 'Covenant of Grace'.

---

1 P. J. DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, p. 105.

2 Cf. G. VERMES, *Scrolls*, p. 26: 'Candidates for admission were required to be native Israelites ...'.

Thus, in the context of 'initiation' at least, the concept of perfection in the Scrolls is not essentially 'legalistic'. This is evident too from the Hymn of the Initiants: '... in His hand are the perfection of my way and the uprightness of my heart' (xi. 2), '...perfection of way is out of His hand' (11), '...for without Thee no way is perfect, and without Thy will nothing is done' (17). 'Perfection', which basically is 'turning away from evil and turning to God'<sup>1</sup>, is grounded on election. It is the 'elect of mankind' who may stand before God for ever. Over against 'those who walk in darkness', i.e. far from God's presence, the initiates were drawn near by God's grace (cf. xi. 13, 14), and consequently are 'sons of light' (cf. 1 QS iii. 24, 25).

There are still other passages which perhaps belong to the context of initiation. According to S. HOLM-NIELSEN, 'this concerns 14: 8-22, 14: 23-28, 16: 1-7, 16: 8-20, 17: 9-15, 17: 17-25'<sup>2</sup>. It is interesting to note that this suggestion coincides with the following statement by G. VERMES: 'Hymn 21 expressly refers to the oath of the Covenant, and Hymn 22 appears to be a poetic commentary on the liturgy of the entry into the Community.'<sup>3</sup> The term *tamim* does not occur in these passages, but 'wholeness of heart' (1b slm), which also belongs to the concept of perfection in the Old Testament:

Because I know all these things  
my tongue shall utter a reply.  
Bowing down and (confessing all) my transgressions,  
I will seek (Thy) spirit (of knowledge);  
cleaving to Thy spirit of (holiness),  
I will hold fast to the truth of Thy Covenant,  
that(I may serve) Thee in truth and wholeness of heart (wlb slm),  
and that I may love (Thy name). (1 QH xvi. 1-7)<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Cf. H. KOSMALA, *Hebräer*, p. 227.

2 S. HOLM-NIELSEN, *Hodayot*, p. 344. This author holds these passages 'to be a matter of recently initiated members' prayers', or, in a few cases, of parts of the liturgy spoken by the priests and levites.

3 *ibid.*, p. 150; in the sentence before our cit. VERMES says, 'Similarly, it is probable that the psalms of this Scroll (sc. 1 QH) were recited by the Guardian and newly initiated members at the Feast of the Renewal of the Covenant. 'Thus for this author, hymns 21, 22 most obviously belong to 'initiation'. The enumeration used is hypothetical in that VERMES has 'counted twenty-five compositions similar to the biblical Psalms.' (p. 149) For Pss 21, 22 see VERMES, pp. 192ff. (These Pss occur in cols. 14-16 of the usual numbering used by HOLM-NIELSEN)

4 G. VERMES, *Scrolls*, p. 196.

I (know, O Lord,  
 that Thou art merciful) and compassionate,  
 (long)-suffering and (rich) in grace and truth,  
 pardoning transgression (and sin).  
 Thou repentest of (evil against them that love Thee)  
 and keep (Thy) commandments,  
 (that) return to Thee with faith  
 and wholeness of heart (wlb slm)  
 ... to serve Thee  
 (and to do that which is) good in Thine eyes.  
 Reject not the fact of Thy servant ... (xvi. 16-18)<sup>1</sup>

S. HOLM-NIELSEN says among his notes concerning the first passage, which is very fragmentary: ' "Seek may have here a liturgical sense in connection with the supposed verbs to do with prayer in the preceding phrase, cf. "seek (God's) face" in Ps. 24:6, 27:8, et al., cf. Dan. Sep. 3:41. ... (xvi. 7:) ... the passage should be dependent upon 2 Ki. 20:3, the only place in the O.T. where "truth" is directly connected to "a perfect heart", which is otherwise a common expression in the O.T. '<sup>2</sup> In G. VERMES' translation - reading 'to serve' instead of 'to walk' as HOLM-NIELSEN and GASTER - 1 QH xvi. 7 becomes a pledge of the initiants, which actually corresponds to the beginning of the Community Rule; '(The Master shall teach the saints) to live (according to) the Book of the Community Rule, that they may seek God with a whole heart and soul, ... ' (1 QS i.1).

In the second passage, the parallelism of 'faith and wholeness of heart' (mwñh wlb slm) is especially noteworthy. It probably 'corresponds to 2 Chr. 19:9, but, with regard to the question of this being a direct use, one must take the same attitude as mentioned in connection with 16:7'<sup>3</sup>. In the context of 2 Chr xix the expression may be said to be a condition for right service of 'certain Levites and priests and heads of families of Israel', especially of 'instruction', whereas in 1 QH xvi the words 'to serve Thee' are found, but not the nature of the service implied.

1 G. VERMES, Scrolls, p. 197.

2 S. HOLM-NIELSEN, Hodayot, p. 235.

3 *ibid.*, p. 240.



To sum up the present section: It has become clear that initiation at Qumran was into the presence of God, and that the fundamental condition of admittance is to 'life perfectly before Him' (1 QS i. 8), or to 'walk perfectly in all His ways' (1 QS ii. 2). The fact that in 1 QS ix. 4-5 the expression 'perfection of way' stands parallel to 'free-will offering' suggests that *tamim* was understood as a cultic term, and thus may be rendered by the expression 'wholly consecrated', as in the cultic texts of the Old Testament. In this connection, KOSMALA's view that the self-designation of the men of the Community, i.e. those 'who have freely pledged themselves', must be understood against the background of 1 QS ix. 4-5 and means that they 'sacrificed' themselves freely, is important, for it supports a cultic understanding of perfection. 'The Hymn of the Initiants' (1 QS x-xi) shows that the members of the Community were no 'perfectionists' in the bad sense. They - or, at least the author of the hymn - realised that the wholeness of their consecration to God is dependent on His election and grace.

Corresponding to the linguistic usage in the Old Testament, the concept of perfection in the Scrolls can also be expressed by 'wholeness of heart' (1 QH xvi. 7, 17).

The feature which most decidedly stresses the sectarian character of the Community at Qumran is the 'terrible oaths' which also belong to the context of initiation.<sup>1</sup> Their purpose is to prevent anyone from entering the Community 'while walking among the idols of his heart' (1 QS ii. 11). Such a person 'shall not be reckoned among the perfect (*tmymym*); he shall neither be purified by atonement, nor cleansed by purifying waters, nor sanctified by seas and rivers, nor washed clean with any ablution. Unclean, unclean shall he be. For as long as he despises the precepts of God he shall receive no instruction in the Community of His counsel' (1 QS iii. 3-6). The purpose of this instruction for the 'way' of Qumran will be briefly discussed in the following section.

---

1 Cf. JOSEPHUS, *War*, p. 373, and 1 QS ii and v.

### 3 The Way of Perfection

The writers of the Dead Sea Scrolls used the term 'way' (drk) very frequently. 'They expressed their turning to God by the old-Biblical term "the Way".'<sup>1</sup> As we have seen in the first section of the present chapter, the Community derived - at least to a great extent - the figure of the way from Is xl.3: The Community is elected by God to prepare His return to His Holy Temple on Mount Zion, which at present is defiled by uncleanness, by wicked priests officiating there and by an unlawful liturgical calendar. It is not improbable that the geographical site at Qumran was chosen because the sectarians took the parallel terms 'wilderness' and 'desert' in Is xl.3 literally. A further reason may be found in Ezek xlvii. 1-12, where Ezekiel prophesies that water will flow from the Holy Place of the New Temple and run down into the Dead Sea, making its water fresh and transforming the wilderness on both sides of the river into an orchard. 'The people of Qumran perhaps expected to see this tremendous miracle at that place with their own eyes.'<sup>2</sup> Another reason seems to be Hos ii. 14-15 where the 'wilderness signifies Israel's early years after the Exodus when she was faithful to the covenant'.<sup>3</sup>

Until Yahweh's return to Zion, the Council of the Community represented the 'Temple' in the sense that the Council is His dwelling-place. In the Temple cult of Jerusalem, as we have seen in our previous chapter, the 'law' has its 'place' after the theophany. There can be no doubt that the law played a central role at Qumran. H. BRAUN even holds that it 'takes the dominating place' and that 'the radical observance of the torah is the main reason for the separation from official Judaism and for the constitution of a separate community'.<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, the self-understanding of Qumran as the 'Spiritual Temple' suggests that the 'place in life' of the law at Qumran may be

---

1 H. KOSMALA, Hebräer, p. 332.

2 R. MAYER/J. REUSS, Die Qumranfunde und die Bibel, Regensburg 1959, p. 47.

3 OAB, ad loc; cf. J. M. ALLEGRO, The Dead Sea Scrolls, (Pelikan Books) Harmondsworth 1961, p. 149.

4 H. BRAUN, Radikalismus I (op. cit.), p. 15.

understood from the Temple cult of Jerusalem, and not, for example, from Rabbinic Judaism.<sup>1</sup>

Admittedly, the difference between 'conditions' and 'commandments' that we found in the cult psalms of the Old Testament is not very clear in the Scrolls. In 1 QS i.8, where we found 'perfection' as a condition, we read that to live wholly consecrated to God must be 'in accordance with all that has been revealed'. The combination of 'perfection' and 'law' is found very frequently. A good example is 1 QS viii. 21f.: 'Every man who enters the Council of Holiness, (the Council of those) who walk in the way of perfection, and who deliberately or through negligence transgresses one word of the Law of Moses, on any point whatever, shall be expelled from the Council of the Community and shall return no more: no man of holiness shall be associated in his property or counsel in any matter at all.'<sup>2</sup>

If we may interpret the relationship between 'perfection' and 'law' from the Temple cult, we may put it this way: The fulfilment of the condition of 'perfection', i.e. the wholeness of consecration to God, is measured on the extent of obedience to the law. In other words, the law is the 'kanon' for 'perfection'. It is a very peculiar feature of the Scrolls that the life of the Community must be 'according to all that has been revealed from age to age, and as the Prophets have revealed by His Holy Spirit.' (1 QS viii. 16)<sup>3</sup>

This insistence on the whole Law and the Prophets perhaps is the reason why there are - as far as we can see - no 'Decalogues', i.e. no series of fundamental 'conditions' or 'commandments' in the Scrolls. 'As far as the Law itself was concerned,' VERMES says, 'the revelations granted to these sons of Zadok, the sect's priestly hierarchy, added fresh severity and rigour to the legal code already strict in itself.'<sup>4</sup>

---

1 This is what H. BRAUN, Radikalismus I, does. He starts his investigation into the Scrolls from 'Abot I-IV', i.e. from a text which - as BRAUN himself admits - is 200 years later than the Manual of Discipline (cf. *ibid.*, p. 15).

2 G. VERMES, Scrolls, p. 86.

3 *ibid.*, p. 86, following the cit. of Is xl.3.

4 *ibid.*, p. 36.



'In addition to its increased severity', VERMES proceeds later, 'the Community's interpretation of the Law was distinguished by its claim to infallibility. Whereas traditional Judaism allowed for some elasticity within orthodoxy itself (Rabbi X declaring lawful an action forbidden by Rabbi Y), no such latitude was apparent in the sect. The true meaning of the Law had been revealed to them by God, and since there is only one God and one truth, there can only be one interpretation of that truth.'<sup>1</sup>

This view of the Community may be interpreted in a positive way: Qumran is aware of the Giver of the Law. We may even go further and say, the purpose of the Law at Qumran was the same as in the Temple cult, namely, to keep the Community in the communion (covenant) with God. This idea is evident in the following passage from the Damascus Rule, together with the condition of 'perfection: 'And God observed their deeds, that they sought Him with a whole heart (blb slm), and raised for them a Teacher of Righteousness to guide them in the way of His heart.' (DR i. 10,11)<sup>2</sup>

Later in the same document, the way of God's heart or those who walk in it are defined as follows: 'who walked in perfection' (hwlky tmym, i.21), 'walk perfectly in all His ways' (lhtlky tmym bkl drkyw, ii.15), walk 'in perfect holiness' (btmym qds, vii. 5), and finally three times 'men of perfect holiness' ('nsy tmym hqds, xx. 2, 5, 7).<sup>3</sup> In the Community Rule, similar expressions occur in i.8, ii.2; iii. 3,9; vi. 17; viii. 1, 9, 10, 18, 20, 21; ix. 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19, and all these expressions may be said to culminate in the self-designation 'the perfect of way' (tmymy drk, iv. 22).

The point of attaching 'way' or 'to walk' to tamim is this: 'Wholeness' in relation to God, entirety of consecration, must manifest itself in the way of life of the Community and the individual initiants. Thus, we believe, B. RIGAUX is not quite right in saying, 'Perfection of way is above all obedience to the divine precepts, as they are put into practice at Qumran; it is the acceptance of the whole monastic life, understood as the expression of a divine will.'<sup>4</sup> In our opinion, 'perfection' is not identical with obedience but manifests itself in obedience.

---

1 G. VERMES, Scrolls, p. 37.

2 *ibid.*, p. 97.

3 For the last three examples see G. VERMES, *ibid.*, p. 106.

4 B. RIGAUX, Perfection (art. cit.), p. 238; cf. also M. BLACK, *cit. above* p. 178, n.1.

The following passage shows a synonymous expression for the 'way of perfection', namely, 'ways of light', and must be understood against the background of ethical dualism of Qumran: 'All the children of righteousness are ruled by the Prince of Light and walk in the ways of light; but all the children of falsehood are ruled by the Angel of Darkness and walk in the ways of darkness.' (1 QS iii)<sup>1</sup>

As to the messianic expectation of the Community, which, as is well known, knows two Messiahs, VERMES says, 'The Davidic Prince was to lead the people to triumph, to defeat the Gentiles, and bring into being the Kingdom of God. In matters of doctrine he was to obey the Priests; the first Commentary on Isaiah states expressly that "as they teach him, so shall he judge". At the Banquet, also, he was to follow after the Priest. The Messiah of Aaron, on the other hand, is represented as the High Priest of the Kingdom. He was to conduct the liturgy during the battle against the ultimate foe, and as the final Interpreter of the Law he was to reveal the significance of the Scriptures and their relevance to events of the Messianic age and to the endless time of eternal bliss.'<sup>2</sup>

We may close the present section with the following statement by M. BLACK, which makes us look forward from the Community of Qumran towards the time of fulfilment, which will be inaugurated by the coming of Yahweh and His Messiah(s): 'When the evidence of this passage (sc. 1 QS iv. 15-26) is taken in conjunction with the eschatology of the Damascus Document, and, in particular, the prominence in the expectation of the sect of the idea of a New Temple in a restored Jerusalem, the general type of eschatology would appear to be that of an expected Kingdom of God (or new Creation) of eternal duration on the present earth, with Jerusalem (and the Temple) as its centre. And this new creation, innocent of all evil, reproduces upon earth the state of Eden before the Fall.'<sup>3</sup>

The evidence of the inter-Testamental religious community of Qumran, then, testifies to a religious outlook which to a great extent is *hierocentric*, and which, at a time approximately contemporary to the historical Jesus, frequently uses a concept of perfection of a *cultic and relational* character, expressed by the terms *tamim*, *tam* and *shalem*.

---

1 G. VERMES, *Scrolls*, p. 75/76.

2 *ibid.*, p. 49.

3 M. BLACK, *Scrolls*, p. 136.

## JESUS AND THE TEMPLE

It is our main hypothesis that the temple cult is the presupposition of the activity of the historical Jesus, as it is evident from the Sermon on the Mount.<sup>1</sup> This hypothesis will be tested in the following two chapters (VII, VIII), on the basis of the 'presupposition' discussed in our previous chapters IV and V. But even if this test will be successful in that it shows a dependence of the Sermon on the Mount on the temple cult, one might still argue that it is not conclusive because in the activity or ministry of Jesus as a whole the temple cult does not seem to play an important role.<sup>2</sup> The attempt must be made, therefore, to show not only that the Sermon on the Mount presupposes the temple cult but also that - as already mentioned in passing<sup>3</sup> - the outlook of the historical Jesus to a great extent is hiero-centric.

The Greek term *τὸ ἱερόν*, which - in contrast to the Septuagint - is used in the New Testament, 'denotes the whole district of the temple, including the temple-mountain.'<sup>4</sup> Therefore, we may use the expression hiero-centric also in order to point to the 'Way of the Lord', i.e. to God's eschatological return to Mount Zion and His subsequent Enthronement as King of all nations in the Temple of Jerusalem (cf. Is xl. 3).<sup>5</sup> It is the purpose of the present chapter to find out whether or not the 'Way of the Lord' served as a pattern for Jesus' ministry or, in other words, whether or not the 'Temple' is a

---

1 See above p. 69.

2 See, e.g., G. SCHRENK, art. *ἱερεὺς*, in: TWNT III, p. 263.

3 See above p. 67.

4 G. SCHRENK, art. *τὸ ἱερόν*, in: TWNT III, p. 234; the term *ναός* - which is used also in the LXX - denotes the temple-house (cf. O. MICHEL, art. *ναός*, in: TWNT IV, pp. 884ff.) According to SCHRENK, the NT does not differentiate strictly between *ἱερόν* and *ναός*, cf. *ibid.*, p. 234.

5 See above p. 63.



unifying theme which links together the different stages of his ministry.<sup>1</sup>

We have seen in our previous chapter that in the Dead Sea Scrolls Is xl.3 plays an important role.<sup>2</sup> At first glance, however, two basic differences are evident: (1) Although there is no doubt that the Community of Qumran believed God to be present in her midst,<sup>3</sup> His actual return to Zion - as far as we can see - was still conceived as a future event, i.e. as an event of the Messianic age.<sup>4</sup> Over against this, Jesus' message of the kingdom points to the actual coming, or return, of God. (2) Whereas in the Scrolls to 'prepare the way of the Lord' obviously is the task of the Community as a whole (cf. 1 QS viii.14-16), in the synoptics the reference is to an individual person, namely to John the Baptist (cf. Mt iii.3 par.).

As we have seen above,<sup>5</sup> the synoptics report Is xl.3 in a Christological interpretation, which most probably was not identical with the view of John himself, who more likely understood this text in its original meaning. We assume, moreover, that to 'prepare the way of the Lord' in John's view was also the role of him 'who is coming' (Mt. iv.11 par.; cf. Mt xi.3 par.), i.e. of Jesus. What is the view of Jesus in this respect? It is worth noting that in Mt xi.10 par. he does not relate Is xl.3 to John but Mal iii.1. We may assume, then, that by passing the role of the 'messenger' - which John had cast for him<sup>6</sup> - to John, Jesus consciously retained for himself the task to prepare the way of Yahweh, and that according to his own interpretation - over against that of Qumran and of John (for the latter cf. Mal iii.1ff.). If this is correct - as we shall try to show in the following discussion - the historical Jesus most probably interpreted Is xl.3 as the task of an individual person, or even: as the task of the Messiah.

It is one of the main theses of HANS CONZELMANN's 'Theology of St Luke' that 'The Journey' reported in Lk ix.51 - xix.27 is a symbolic figure that serves the representation of a Christological conception: 'The Journey' is framed by the Predictions of the Passion (cf. Lk ix.18f.,

---

1 Cf. above pp.55ff.

2 See above pp.178ff.

3 Cf. above p.181; (cit. KOSMALA).

4 Cf. above p.197; (cit. VERMES, BLACK).

5 Cf. p.55.

6 See above p. 57; (cit J.A.T. ROBINSON).

43bf. / Lk xviii.31 f.) and is itself an expression of Jesus' consciousness of suffering (*Leidensbewusstsein*).<sup>1</sup> CONZELMANN may be right in that the 'Journey' in this sense is Luke's redactional interpretation of the tradition before him.<sup>2</sup> As the 'Way of Jesus' is depicted in all three synoptics in three main parts, i.e. Galilee, The Journey, Jerusalem,<sup>3</sup> it is obvious that 'The Journey' cannot be Luke's invention - although he expands the middle section considerably. What, then, is the origin of 'The Journey'? We propose that it is nothing else than 'The Way of the Lord' that Jesus and his disciples followed from Galilee to Zion. This seems to be confirmed by the observation - mentioned also by CONZELMANN<sup>4</sup> - that according to Luke the destination of the 'Journey' exclusively is the Temple (i.e. Zion), and not the city of Jerusalem (cf. Lk xix.45 over against Mt xxi. 10-12; Mk xi. 11).<sup>5</sup> Moreover, Acts ix.2, xix.9,23, xxii.4, xxiv.14,22 suggest that Luke knows the early Christian self-designation as those 'belonging to the Way', which perhaps originally was derived from the conception of the 'Way of the Lord'.<sup>6</sup> It is not surprising that Luke interprets the 'way' ('Journey') Christologically, for Is xl.3 seems to have been interpreted Christologically long before, and that in the sense of Christ's instead of God's coming to Zion.

If Jesus understood his work to be a preparation of the 'Way of the Lord', (in the theocentric sense), his understanding at the same time implied a Christology, i.e. a specific understanding of his person. 'It is impossible', G. SEVENSTER says, 'to state the significance of the work, if at the same time one does not elucidate who the person is through whom it is done. But also the opposite seems to be true time and again: the work brings out the significance of the person.'<sup>7</sup> Theoretically speaking, then, two different approaches to 'Christology' (i.e. person and work of Jesus) are possible: (1) we may begin

1 Cf. H. CONZELMANN, *Luke* (see above p.12, n.2), Part I, B, b; and c 1. Cf also R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, pp. 26 and 385: 'the journey through Samaria', or 'the travel narrative', 'is Luke's construction'.

2 Cf. the conception of a journey in Mk ix.30, x.17, 32, 46.

3 Cf. H. CONZELMANN, *ibid.*, the sections of Part I, B: a, c, b; and also A. HUCK's *Synopsis*. HUCK speaks of 'The Journey to Jerusalem' in connection with Mt xix-xx parr.

4 *ibid.*, Part I, B, c 3.

5 The fact that Mt and Mk mention the city first does not speak against the actual destination of the 'Way' being Mount Zion, for to enter the Temple seems to be (geographically) impossible without entering Jerusalem first.

6 Cf. above p. 64.

7 G. SEVENSTER, *De Christologie van het Nieuwe Testament*, (2nd ed.) Amsterdam 1948, p. 8.

either with the work of Christ and proceed to his person as evident in the Christological titles, or (2) begin with the Christological titles (person) and relate them to Christ's work. SEVENSTER himself seems to combine the two approaches,<sup>1</sup> whilst OSCAR CULLMANN's 'Christology' is a clear example of the second approach: CULLMANN starts with an analysis of the Christological titles.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless he strongly emphasizes the significance of the work, when he says, 'Because the first Christians see God's redemptive revelation in Jesus Christ, for them it is his very nature that he can be known only in his work - fundamentally in the central work accomplished in the flesh. Therefore, in the light of the New Testament witness, all mere speculation about his nature is an absurdity. Functional Christology is the only kind which exists.'<sup>3</sup>

CULLMANN regards not only the New Testament but also all 'Heilsgeschichte' (i.e. 'history of salvation' and 'saving history', cf. *ibid.*, p. xv ii) as 'Christocentric'.<sup>4</sup> The earliest confessions of faith prove that this was indeed the view of the early Church. But may we presuppose a similar view already for the historical Jesus? Our hypothesis that Jesus' outlook to a great extent was hiero-centric implies that his view to the same extent was theocentric.<sup>5</sup> Thus the question arises: where do we find the transition from a theocentric to a Christocentric view?

In this connection JEAN-LOUIS LEUBA has made some pertinent observations.<sup>6</sup> One of his hypotheses is that 'primitive Christology seems to revolve around two essential titles', namely the institutional titles and the spiritual titles.<sup>7</sup> Whereas the former 'as such do not imply the passion, death and resurrection of Jesus',<sup>8</sup> the latter 'are connected at once with the passion, death and resurrection of Jesus'.<sup>9</sup> 'Thus', LEUBA proceeds, 'the institutional titles appear as fixing a framework within which the divine initiative

---

1 Cf. *ibid.*, Contents, p. 389: I The Synoptic Gospels (of course, the discussion already touches Jesus' work); II.A The Christological Titles; B. The Saving-Work of Christ.

2 O. CULLMANN, *Christology* (see above p. 102, n.3), pp.6ff.

3 *ibid.*, p. 326.

4 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 326.

5 Although this is no contrast for the early Church, for the message of Jesus the difference is evident: he proclaims the nearness of God's kingdom and not the nearness of His Anointed (Christ).

6 See J. L. LEUBA, *New Testament Pattern*, An exegetical inquiry into the "catholic" and "protestant" dualism (ET), London 1953.

7 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 12.

8 *ibid.*, p. 25.

9 *ibid.*, p. 26.



works out the drama of salvation, attested by spiritual titles.<sup>1</sup> LEUBA's answer to our question mentioned above is contained in the following statement: 'A further aspect of the distinction between the framework and contents of the drama of redemption is the following: the institutional titles bear witness to the work which God accomplishes by means of the Christ, the spiritual titles emphasize rather the divine work which Jesus Himself accomplishes by His own intrinsic authority which is the reward of His obedience. The former imply a theocentric theology, the latter a Christocentric one.'<sup>2</sup> This is to say, the transition from a theo-centric to a Christocentric view or theology happened even before the resurrection of Jesus.

We shall have to keep in mind this possibility in our following discussion. On the whole, the 'Christological Dualism' observed by LEUBA in our opinion is not quite convincing. For example, when he classifies 'Son of David, King of the Jews, King of Israel, Christ, Son of God' among the institutional titles,<sup>3</sup> LEUBA separates the two titles which in the royal ideology designate the king, namely: Son and Servant of God.<sup>4</sup> In our opinion, this is the 'Christological Dualism' which lies at the root of New Testament Christology: Jesus is both the representative of God, i.e. His Son, and the representative of His people, i.e. His Servant. Of this dualism LEUBA would be right in saying, 'The ontological dualism of Chalcedon may thus be interpreted as the projection, on the plane of Greek thought, of another dualism which belongs specifically to the New Testament and is integral to the Hebraic world-view.'<sup>5</sup> This is to say in Hebrew thought which is dynamic over against the purely static Greek conceptions: as God's 'extension' Jesus is God 'in Person', whilst as 'extension' of the people Jesus is fully human.

---

1 J. L. LEUBA, *ibid.*, p. 26.

2 *ibid.*, p. 27.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 15.

4 See above p. 121, and *ibid.*, n. 2 (J. MORGENSTERN's thesis).

5 *ibid.*, p. 50; as to LEUBA's own point, cf. this sentence: 'What Chalcedon affirms concerning the differences and the relations between the human and the divine natures of the Christ might be reproduced with reference to the dualism of the Christos Kyrios. (*ibid.*, p. 49) - In LEUBA's view, the confession 'Kyrios Christos' expresses both the dualism of Christology and the unity of Christ (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 32. ff.).

The conjecture that Son / Servant might be the original Christological dualism seems to be confirmed by the voice from heaven which Jesus hears when he is baptized by John:

Thou art my beloved Son (  $\delta \upsilon \dot{\iota} \acute{\omicron} \varsigma \mu \omicron \upsilon \delta \acute{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi \eta \tau \acute{\omicron} \varsigma$  ),

with thee I am well pleased (  $\epsilon \nu \sigma \omicron \iota \epsilon \upsilon \sigma \acute{\omicron} \kappa \eta \sigma \alpha$  ). (Mk i.11)

We note first that Matthew's version (This is ... with whom ..., iii.17) as a matter of form is a proclamation of Jesus' divine sonship,<sup>1</sup> whereas Mark's and Luke's version may be defined as an 'anointment oracle' (cf. Mk i.10 par.). The latter is suggested also by the reading reported by some MSS in connection with Lk iii.22, according to which the voice from heaven quotes Ps ii.7.<sup>2</sup> Second, the 'anointment oracle' Mk i.11 par. as well as Matthew's version contains an allusion to Is xlii.1, xlii.2, i.e. to the Servant of God ('ebed YHWH).<sup>3</sup> This is supported by Jn i.34, where some MSS have  $\delta \epsilon \kappa \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau \acute{\omicron} \varsigma$  instead of  $\delta \upsilon \dot{\iota} \acute{\omicron} \varsigma$ , whilst the Septuagint uses the same word for *bahir* in Is xlii. 1 (cf. xlii.2 LXX:  $\delta \nu \epsilon \xi \epsilon \lambda - \epsilon \xi \acute{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ).<sup>4</sup> As in the Old Testament Son (*ben*) and Servant ('*ebed*) belong together,<sup>5</sup> it is reasonable to conclude that in Mk i.11 par. we have originally to do with an 'anointment oracle' which points to Jesus' enthronement as King-Messiah. Accordingly, Jesus knew himself to be both the Son and the Servant of God. Thus the following statement by J. MORGENSTERN applies also to Jesus' sonship: 'Unquestionably baptism in the N.T. is the equivalent of anointing in the O.T., and the baptism of Jesus, with all its significant effects, corresponds in every respect to the anointing of the Servant with its significant effects. And each, in his unique role as the Messiah, the Christ, "the Anointed One", brings a message and functions as God's divinely chosen agent of universal salvation.'<sup>6</sup>

1 J. BIENECK, *Sohn Gottes* (cf. above p. 102), p. 36, suggests that this proclamation is directed to John the Baptist.

2 See however J. BIENECK, *ibid.*, pp. 36 and 58: we have to do here with an error of a copyist. BIENECK does not recognise the significance of the difference between Matthew's version and the original one (Mk, Lk) which is a matter of function (cf. *ibid.*, p. 59/60). Both the form of Mk i.11 par. and the term 'son', we believe, consciously point to Ps ii.7. Cf. O. CULLMANN, *Christology*, p. 66: 'We must of course reckon with the possibility that the thought of Ps 2.7 ('You are my son, today I have begotten you') suggested itself as a parallel, and facilitated the translation  $\upsilon \dot{\iota} \acute{\omicron} \varsigma$ .'

3 Cf. O. CULLMANN, *ibid.*, pp. 66: 'We may consider it certain that the words of the voice from heaven are really a citation of this passage in Isaiah.' (i.e. xlii.1).

4 On the witness of John see *ibid.*, p. 67/68.

5 So also J. BIENECK, *ibid.*, p. 62; cf. O. CULLMANN, *ibid.*, p. 66, n.4.

6 J. MORGENSTERN, *Servant*, p. 422.

In connection with the Baptism of Jesus his Temptation (Mt iv. 1-11 // Mk i. 12-13 // Lk iv. 1-13) is of interest, because the latter seems to be a 'commentary' upon the voice from heaven in the context of the former (i.e. Mk i.11 parr.).<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the Temptation not only contains the concept of sonship (cf. Mt iv.3 par.; Mt iv.6 par.) too, but in addition to that a reference to the Temple (cf. Mt iv.5 par.). May we use then the Temptation as evidence for our hypothesis that the outlook of Jesus to a great extent was hiero-centric? Although the passage seems to belong to the common catechetical source (in this case we have to regard Mark's version as an abbreviation), its value as evidence is doubtful. Perhaps R. BULTMANN is right in saying, that the Temptation presupposes 'the idea of a υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ of whom miracle is characteristic. That does not befit the Jewish messianic conception of the Son of God, but much more the Hellenistic. Judaism certainly anticipated miracles in the Messianic Age (Matt. 11.2-6 belongs here too) but had no notion of the figure of Messiah as miracle worker.'<sup>2</sup> In this case the 'commentary' Mt iv.1f. parr. intends to preserve the concept of sonship contained in the heavenly voice from a misunderstanding in a Hellenistic sense and consequently is a secondary formulation.<sup>3</sup>

Of course, we can offer a complete Christology neither in the present chapter nor in our study as a whole. The subject of the latter compels us to begin with (part of) Jesus' work (i.e. the Sermon), from which we shall try to derive the Christology implied. Our discussion in the following section is only provisional and will be taken up again in chapters VII and VIII. As to the further work of Jesus discussed in sections two and three of this present chapter, we can only point to current solutions or to possibilities which will require further examination. We have mentioned already our hypothesis that the ministry of Jesus to a great extent is hiero-centric or, in other words, patterned after the 'Way of the Lord'. Thus we classify Jesus' work in three sections, under the heading 'Jesus and the Temple', namely: (1) At the beginning of the Way; (2) On the Way; (3) Returned to Mount Zion.

---

1 This is suggested by J. BIENECK, *Sohn Gottes*, p. 63.

2 R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p. 257.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 254: 'The dialogue between Jesus and the devil reflects Rabbinic disputations.' And also p. 255, where BULTMANN - following FRIDRICHSEN - suggests as the more probable judgment that the Temptation story 'was meant as a warning to the Church against thinking too much of miracles and against using them for its own self-centred purposes.' See however J. BIENECK, *ibid.*, pp. 63ff., who wants to understand the Temptation as an interpretation of sonship in terms of the Servant, in this, BIENECK is hardly successful. In our opinion, Jesus' own interpretation of sonship is contained above all in the Sermon and in Mt xi. 27, as will be demonstrated below, VIII.3.



## 1 The beginning of the Way

The centrality of the concept of the kingdom of God // heaven(s) in the message of Jesus can hardly be questioned. W. SCHMIDT's observation quoted above, namely, 'Divine kingship and temple are inseparable',<sup>1</sup> suggests that the concept of the Temple derives its centrality from that of the kingdom. We may recall here also TH. OESTREICHER's finding that the Hebrew term for temple (hekhal) stems from the Sumerian e-gal (e = house, gal = great) and denotes the temple, whereas in the Assyrian-Babylonian language (ekallu) it means 'royal palace'.<sup>2</sup> This ambiguity of the original concept is explained by OESTREICHER as follows: 'The king is the representative of God on earth. Therefore God's house and the king's house originally are identical. Only through the secularization of the kingship the two houses are differentiated.'<sup>3</sup> ... In short the hekhal is the temple of the kingdom, the political and religious centre of the state.'<sup>4</sup> Admittedly, Israel seems to have held this view of the Temple of Jerusalem only in pre-exilic times, whilst later the Temple lost its political significance.<sup>5</sup> However, there are reasons to believe that in the view of the historical Jesus Temple and kingship still belong together. As far as we can see, this possibility has not yet been sufficiently realised in discussions about 'Jesus and the Temple'.

Two books, which were recently translated into English, deal in detail with this theme, namely ERNST LOHMEYER's 'Lord of the Temple'<sup>6</sup> and YVES M. J. CONGAR's 'The Mystery of the Temple'.<sup>7</sup>

---

1 See above p. 100.

2 Cf. TH. OESTREICHER, Reichstempel und Ortsheiligtümer in Israel, (BFT Vol. 33) Gütersloh 1930, p.12.

3 *ibid.*, p. 13.

4 *ibid.*, p. 15.

5 Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 39f; for the pre-exilic hekhal concept the Book of Micah is of special interest: see Mic iv. 1f. // Is ii.2-4 for the figure of the eschatological mountain; according to vs 8 the restored Davidic kingdom will come to Zion, i.e. to the Temple mount. Furthermore, Mic v.2 (Heb. v. 1) is quoted in Mt ii.6: the 'ruler' (moshel) in Israel is identified with Jesus.

6 E. LOHMEYER, Lord of the Temple (ET), Edinburgh and London 1961.

7 Y. M. J. CONGAR, O.P., The Mystery of the Temple, or, The Manner of God's Presence to His Creatures from Genesis to the Apocalypse (ET), London 1962, see esp. pp. 112 ff: VI. Jesus and the Temple.

Both authors clearly recognise the importance of this theme for the understanding of the Gospels.

Although we shall confine the discussion of the present chapter to the synoptic Gospels, we may begin here with CONGAR's opening words to the theme, in which the Gospel of John is included: 'When the Gospel texts are read straight through with a view to discovering the attitude of Jesus towards the Temple and all it represented, two apparently contradictory features become immediately apparent: Jesus' immense respect for the Temple; his very lively criticism of abuses and of formalism, yet above and beyond this, his constantly repeated assertion that the Temple is to be transcended, that it has had its day, that it is doomed to disappear.'<sup>1</sup>

In the beginning of his book, LOHMEYER gives a vivid historical picture of the same theme: 'In the land of the Jews the one and only true Temple of God stood on holy Mount Sion. There almost constantly the smoke of sacrifices curled towards the skies; there untold throngs of priests and high priests, Levites and singers - the number has been estimated at a quarter of the whole population - lived by the holy service which went on daily, almost hourly, to the glory of the one God of heaven and earth. And yet before a hundred years had passed Pliny was lamenting the desolation of the temples and the abandonment of sacrifices; the sanctuary in Jerusalem was burned to the ground and the Jewish people never again sought to offer to God a holy sacrifice in a holy temple.'<sup>2</sup>

LOHMEYER defines the purpose of his book and his working hypothesis as follows: 'In all the host of questions which these facts (sc. that early Christianity abandoned both the Jewish Temple and the Jewish cult) throw up, the one which concerns us is not merely how Jesus or the early community viewed the Jewish cult, or how they produced an early Christian cult. Our theme sets alongside the one "thing", the cult, the other "thing", the Gospel. The word Gospel is to be understood concretely with the only meaning it has in the Gospels themselves - the word and the event, both intimately bound up with the person of Jesus Christ. ... One thing alone can explain it (sc. the passing of all ancient cult and the

---

1 *ibid.*, p. 112; cf. also G. SCHRENK, art. *τὸ ἱερόν*, in: *TWNT III*, p. 241/42.

2 E. LOHMEYER, *Temple*, p.2.

emergence of a Christian cult), and that is the original content and the original self-sufficient power of the Gospel itself.<sup>1</sup> Then, LOHMEYER proceeds to ask the decisive question, namely, '... for where in the Gospel tradition do we find any words which could be taken to indicate the birth of a new cult?' LOHMEYER's immediate answer is this: 'We look for them in vain in the Sermon on the Mount or in Jesus' parables.'<sup>2</sup>

We want to argue that the 'words which could be taken to indicate the birth of a new cult', or, in our own terminology, the beginning of the (new) Way, are found in the Sermon on the Mount. Recalling the definition of the Sermon as 'learnt gospel', we recognise that LOHMEYER's main thesis, namely that the gospel alone can explain the emergence of a Christian cult, seems to be correct. But we would define the word 'gospel' - in accordance with the Old Testament - as the coming of God Himself in order to inaugurate His universal kingdom.

The question concerning the inauguration of the kingdom, or, in other words, How near was the kingdom in the view of Jesus? - is still much disputed. HANS CONZELMANN sums up not less than five different answers given by contemporary New Testament scholars.<sup>3</sup>

For our purpose, namely to find out whether or not the concept of the kingdom belonged to that of the Temple in the mind of Jesus, we may start from the following two conclusions T. W. MANSON arrived at more than thirty years ago: '(1) The notions of the Kingdom as a present reality and as a future consummation are not contradictory or mutually exclusive when they are rightly apprehended as corollaries of the eternal sovereignty of God. (2) In the teaching of Jesus the Kingdom as a present reality is thought of as something that has come into existence during the course of his own ministry.'<sup>4</sup>

If we ask, When did the kingdom come into existence? - MANSON answers: 'In fact all debate about such questions as whether the Kingdom is present or future: and, if future, when, how and

---

1 E. LOHMEYER, Temple, p. 4.

2 *ibid.*, p. 4.

3 See H. CONZELMANN, art. 'Jesus Christus', in: RGG III, col. 642; cf. also GÖSTA LUNDSTRÖM, The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus, A History of Interpretation from the Last Decades of the Nineteenth Century to the Present Day (ET), Edinburgh-London 1963; NORMAN PERRIN, The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus, London 1963; and RUDOLF SCHNACKENBURG, God's Rule and Kingdom (ET), Edinburgh-London 1963, esp. pp. 77ff.

4 T. W. MANSON, The Teaching of Jesus, Studies of its Form and Content, (8th ed.) Cambridge 1955, p.140; cf. also N. PERRIN, *ibid.*, pp. 158 ff.



where it is to appear, are a mere beating of the air until the vital question is first answered - what the Kingdom is.<sup>1</sup> The following statement contains MANSON's answer to this vital question: 'The Kingdom of God in its essence is the Reign of God, a personal relation between God and the individual; and there is no point in asking whether it is present or future, just as there is no point in asking whether the Fatherhood of God is present or future. It is something independent of temporal and spatial relations. It is a standing claim made by God on the loyalty and obedience of man. From time to time individuals admit this claim and accept the sovereignty of God. ... When the sovereignty of God is thus accepted the Kingdom becomes a present reality to those who are the subjects of the King.'<sup>2</sup>

MANSON certainly is right in saying that in Israel there was a tendency 'towards the individualising and universalising of this aspect (sc. the manifestation) of the Kingdom.'<sup>3</sup> However, he does not seem to realise sufficiently that at the time of Jesus the concept of the kingdom most probably still was linked with the temple cult. The following quotation once again shows what we call the 'presupposition' of the Sermon on the Mount, and at the same time indicates the nature of the connection between the two concepts 'kingdom' and 'temple': 'Before the destruction'. R. HUMMEL says, 'the Temple of Jerusalem was the religious centre of the Jewish people. The existence of the temple of Onias hardly changed this. Judaism of the diaspora too was faithful to the Temple of Jerusalem. The coming into existence of the institution of the synagogue enabled Judaism to overcome the catastrophe of the year A.D. 70. However it did not cause a devaluation of the Temple before this date and in fact did not want to do this.'<sup>4</sup> ... The significance of the Temple consisted for Judaism in the fact that it was the dwelling-place of God, or, of the Shekina, and that there the cult of the sacrifices, which was commanded by God, was celebrated. On the one hand it was the guarantee for the presence of God among his people, and on the other hand it was the place where the relation between God and

---

1 T. W. MANSON, Teaching, p. 117.

2 *ibid.*, p. 135 (our spacing); cf. also N. PERRIN, *op. cit.*, p. 192: 'But the point implicit in both (sc. the address in the Lord's Prayer and in Mk x.15) is the same: the experience of the Kingdom of God is the experience of new relationship with God; the manifestation of the kingly activity of God in history and human experience is to lead to this new relationship with God. This is to be enjoyed now (abba) and it will in some way be consummated in the future (Mark 10.15 par.).'

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 137.

4 Cf. to this statement C. F. D. MOULE, Worship in the New Testament, London 1961, p. 10: 'As is well known, the Temple at Jerusalem continued, until its destruction in A.D. 70, to be the focus of Jewish worship.'

the people and between the individual members of the people was renewed and confirmed.<sup>1</sup>

Hence we may conclude that the connection between the two concepts 'kingdom' and 'temple' lies in their common aspect of relation between God and the people (individual). In short: the relation between the heavenly King and his subjects in a great measure was renewed and confirmed in the temple cult. To this renewal of the 'vertical' relation belongs, of course, the renewal of the 'horizontal' relation between man and man. After the question, What is the kingdom? - is answered provisionally, we may return to the question as to when and where the kingdom is to appear or, in other words, as to when and where 'a personal relation between God and the individual' is renewed according to the synoptics.

Our answer is: the appearance of the kingdom, the renewal of a personal relation, or, the beginning of God's eschatological return to Mount Zion is marked by the Sermon on the Mount. The meaning of this answer depends on the understanding of the Sermon, and above all on the significance we attach to the Mount of the Sermon.<sup>2</sup> If we hold the Sermon to be 'merely a collection of unrelated sayings of diverse origins, a patchwork, which cannot possibly retain the pre-eminence once accorded to it as the authoritative source for the teaching of Jesus',<sup>3</sup> our answer would imply that 'we are left very largely in the dark as to where the sayings should properly be placed in the teaching',<sup>4</sup> and thus a temporal and spatial location of the 'beginning' would be impossible. Consequently, our answer mentioned above would mean: the appearance of the kingdom is marked by the 'revelation' through Jesus, which is reflected in the materials of the Sermon.<sup>5</sup>

Over against this, we believe the basic composition of the Sermon on the Mount to belong to the oldest Jesus tradition and, moreover, that it is quite possible that the historical Jesus actually taught on the geographical 'Mount of the Sermon' during his early ministry in Galilee.<sup>6</sup>

---

1 R. HUMMEL, *op. cit.*, p. 76/77 (our spacing).

2 See above pp. 47ff.

3 W. D. DAVIES, *Setting*, p. 1.

4 T. W. MANSON, *Teaching*, p. 97; of course, MANSON is right to a certain extent. We do not deny the existence of editorial extensions in the present form of the Sermon.

5 Cf. G. STRECKER, *op. cit.*, p. 98: the 'mountain' signifies a 'place of revelation'.

6 See above pp. 63f.

If we agree provisionally to the second possibility, we may proceed to the question, if, then, the 'mountain' was meant to recall Mount Zion, what is meant to recall the Temple in the context of the Sermon on the Mount?

Y. M.-J. CONGAR maintains - of course, without referring to the Sermon - 'Henceforth the true temple, the true dwelling-place of God among men is none other than the person of Jesus himself.'<sup>1</sup> Later in his study, however, he makes the following observation: 'When we pass from the Gospels to the epistles written by the apostles, we are somewhat surprised at first not to find in them what we may call the essential teaching of the Gospels on Christ as the Temple of the messianic era. This temple is now the Church. ... wherever we discover a Christian statement after Pentecost dealing with the question of the temple, we are faced with a declaration that is unequivocal and perfectly complete from the first: the temple is the Church herself, the community of the faithful.'<sup>2</sup>

As evidence of the epistles is quite clear on this point, the more probable conclusion is that Y.M.-J. CONGAR is mistaken in what he calls the 'essential teaching of the Gospels on Christ', if by this he refers to the synoptics. In the case of John, however, he is probably right (cf. Jn ii.21). We suggest therefore: Corresponding to the possibility that the mount of the Sermon in the view of Jesus himself was meant to recall Mount Zion, the community of Jesus and his intimate disciples is meant to recall the Temple, and that in the sense that God dwells and rules in the midst of them.<sup>3</sup>

The following statement by T. W. MANSON about the kingdom links up perfectly with this hypothesis: 'The Kingdom of God is manifested on earth - in part at any rate - by the fact that there exists a community of people who are his people, who own him as their King and show their loyalty by their obedience to his commands.'<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Y.M.-J. CONGAR, *op.cit.*, p. 118.

2 *ibid.*, p. 151; we omitted from the cit. the sentence, 'The few traces of the theme so often proclaimed by our Lord, as we have shown, are found in three passages which we shall deal with in due course. They are Col. 2.9; Ephh 2. 20-2; 1 Peter 2.4-8.'

3 This is in accordance with the concept of the 'Spiritual Temple' in the DSS; see above p.181.

4 T. W. MANSON, *Teaching*, p. 185; cf. also H. WINDISCH, *The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount*, (see above p. 74), p. 28: 'The Kingdom of God is a holy habitation of the messianic salvation era. It is a fusion of the holy land, the holy city, and the holy temple ...'.



What is the relationship between kingdom and temple in the view of Jesus? - E. LOHMEYER suggests, referring - among others - to the words 'enter the Kingdom', 'All these expressions make it clear that the Kingdom of Heaven is the House or the City of God.'<sup>1</sup> Later, however, LOHMEYER says, 'And the distinction between Temple and "basileia" is of course perfectly clear',<sup>2</sup> namely: 'This being at hand which is predicated of God's Kingdom and House is a "new" eschatological event. In the Jewish cult God's house is the place where He operates His "basileia" and will operate it; here it is the product of His rule. There the "basileia" is connected with a definite place and is conditioned by all the historical circumstances of the people and of the land. Here the "basileia" is the eternal place of God's abiding with His own, and in face of its eschatological glory all historical limits take flight. This very contrast, however, clearly reveals the close connexion between the cultic sanctuary and the eschatological House of God.'<sup>3</sup>

In our opinion, what E. LOHMEYER is describing here is the view of the early Church, which is the result of 'the translation of the eschatology of Jesus into the thought-forms of apocalyptic.'<sup>4</sup> In this process, as far as the evidence of the final redaction of Matthew and of Luke is concerned, the concept of the kingdom became wholly futuristic<sup>5</sup> and - we believe - completely lost contact with the concept of the Spiritual Temple.

---

1 E. LOHMEYER, op. cit. p. 63; cf. also SVERRE AALEN, 'Reign' and 'House' in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels, in: *NTS*, Vol. VIII, 1961-62, pp. 215-240; on p. 229 this author says as LOHMEYER before him: 'The kingdom of God is a house.' It is not quite clear to us whether or not AALEN by 'house' means the (Spiritual) Temple. His final conclusion reads, 'This word (sc. basileia) came to mean a realm, a community, something very near to the new concept of "house", and no longer kingship or reign of God.' (p. 240) - As we have mentioned above, H. WINDISCH, *Die Sprüche vom Eingehen in das Reich Gottes*, (see above p. 74) was first to recognise the cultic background, and thus the relationship between kingdom and temple, thereby using S. MOWINCKEL's findings (cf. art. cit. p. 180) at a later stage of his own investigations.

2 E. LOHMEYER, *ibid.*, p. 65.

3 *ibid.*, p. 66; note that LOHMEYER - if we understand him correctly - uses the term 'eschatological' strictly in a 'futuristic' sense.

4 JOHN A. T. ROBINSON, *Jesus and His Coming*, The Emergence of a Doctrine, London 1957, p. 98.

5 G. BORNKAMM, *Matthew*, p. 34, points out that 'the kingdom of God' is 'consistently understood eschatologically by him', i.e. (the redactor of) Matthew, and goes on, saying, 'Even where Matthew actually - once only - speaks of the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ as having come, with a saying derived from Q ("But if I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you", 12.28), the present is still characterised by the context as the time of decision (12.30), the future nature of the judgment is retained (12.27.36f.), and the distinction between this (still continuing) and the future aeon is not abandoned (12.32).'

We try to support our previous statement by the following evidence. Our point of departure is Mt vii.13-14:

Enter by the narrow gate;  
for the gate is wide and the way is easy,  
that leads to destruction,  
and those who enter it are many.  
For the gate is narrow and the way is hard,  
that leads to life,  
and those who find it are few.

First, it is quite clear that 'life' (ζωή) refers to the future.<sup>1</sup> Second, it is just as clear that the first line of vs. 13 refers to the present. In fact, Luke supplies the evidence for this second point.

The saying Lk xiii. 24 perhaps is an editorial re-statement of the present saying, and that a re-statement in the light of the so-called 'eschatological delay'.<sup>2</sup> R. BULTMANN seems to have in mind Luke's rather than Matthew's version, when he suggests Mt vii. 13f. - among other sayings - to be 'the product of an energetic summons to repentance'.<sup>3</sup> This is to say, whereas in Luke the reader is summoned only to 'Strive to enter ...' (ἀγωνίζεσθε εἰσελθεῖν ....), the authentic saying is an invitation: 'Enter ...' (εἰσελθατε ....). The following statement by DAMASUS WINZEN, we believe, points the way to the right interpretation of Mt vii. 13-14<sup>4</sup>: 'To pass through a door is an initiation and a consecration, because it means to leave behind the past and to enter into a new life. To the Romans of old, the victorious army, by marching through the arch of triumph was

1 Cf. A. RICHARDSON, Theology, p. 73/74: 'The fact is that in the NT ζωή ... is an eschatological conception ...'.

2 The whole passage Lk xiii. 22-30, to which vss. 22-24a provide the setting (cf. T.W. MANSON, Sayings, p. 124), most probably is an editorial composition, consisting partially of sayings from the old tradition. The passage is particularly interesting with respect to Luke's editorial activity. For his 'eschatological' point of view see H. CONZELMANN, Luke, p. 230: 'The actual significance of the statements concerning the blessings of salvation is connected with the eschatological delay. Just as the Eschaton no longer signifies present, but exclusively future circumstances, so also eternal life is removed into the distance. ... Thus (sc. as the believer has the substitute of the Spirit) the fact of the future life is no longer dependent on the imminence of God's reign, and as a promise it can surmount the passage of time.'

3 R. BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 105; cf. also Jesus, p. 31.

4 Admittedly, this explanation does not refer - according to its author - to Mt vii.13-14 but to the 'door' in Jn x.1ff.

cleansed of past offences and consecrated to a new era of peace. For the people of the Old Testament, the temple gate of Jerusalem took the place of the arch of triumph. No armies marched through it, but the festive throngs of the pilgrims approached it in a solemn procession on the Feast of the Tabernacles. Their summons rang out to the warders: "This is the gate of the Lord. The righteous shall enter into it!" (Ps. 118:19 - 20).<sup>1</sup> In our context, and thus for the exegesis of Mt vii. 13-14, we have to ask for the origin of the symbol of the 'narrow gate' in the mind of Jesus. From this point of view, it will be agreed that the reference to the temple gate in Jerusalem is fair.

This interpretation implies that there is a possibility of entering into the 'Spiritual Temple', i.e. the eschatological community now. But what about its relation to the kingdom? As early as 1928 H. WINDISCH observed, 'Jesus transferred the Temple-toroth to the βασιλεία'. What is represented by the Temple in later Judaism, in the Gospel clearly is the coming kingdom.<sup>2</sup> What he did not see, however, is the possibility that Jesus, instead of substituting the kingdom for the Temple, at first seems to have used both conceptions side by side.<sup>3</sup>

Taking the findings of the criticism of the final redaction into account, we are able to discern the following development of the sayings about entering:<sup>4</sup> The first Beatitude, Mt v.3 / Lk vi. 20, '... for theirs (yours) is the kingdom of heaven (of God)' almost certainly belongs to the oldest stratum. The same may be said of Mt vii. 13-14, 'Enter the narrow gate ...'. If this is correct, we may assume that at this stage the two conceptions still are kept apart: You can 'enter' the Temple but yours 'is the kingdom'.

---

1 D. WINZEN, O.S.B., Symbols of Christ, London 1957 (U.S.A. 1955) p. 69/70.

2 H. WINDISCH, Eingehen, p. 182.

3 The same criticism, as far as we can see, applies to the article by S. AALEN.

4 See for the following the collection of kingdom-sayings in T. W. MANSON, Teaching, pp. 118 ff.



However, the two conceptions already merged to a certain extent within the oldest stratum.<sup>1</sup> 'There is thus evidence', T. W. MANSON says, 'that in the latter part of the ministry Jesus began to speak of the Kingdom of God as something into which men enter.'<sup>2</sup> This is right in so far as Jesus explicitly used this expression. We shall try to show below that the first Beatitude already implied the initiation of the disciples into the Kingdom.

The saying Mk x.25 // Mt xix.24 // Lk xviii.25 perhaps is an example of the time mentioned by T. W. MANSON: 'It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.' It is worth noting that Mk x.24, - 'Children, how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!'<sup>3</sup> - conveys the same idea which is implied in the imagery of the 'narrow' (στενός) gate. Both sayings - as the context shows - point to the 'entry' as a present possibility.

In the later strata, which show the hand of the first compiler or of the final redaction, we note an increase of the expression 'enter the kingdom', and that with a clear future reference. The best example for this is Mt vii.21 // Lk vi. 46, which we hold to be an introduction to the parable of the 'House'.<sup>4</sup> As such it originates perhaps from the first compiler as far as the Lucan parallel goes. The redaction of Matthew re-stated it as a 'condition of admission'<sup>5</sup>: 'Not every one who says to me, "Lord, Lord", shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven.' Whereas two features of the present saying, i.e. 'Lord, Lord' and the verb 'do', seem to go back to an older tradition, Mt v.20 is purely editorial<sup>6</sup>: 'For I tell you, unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven.'

- 1 This is to say, the Temple (House') does not become part of the concept of kingdom, as E. LOHMEYER and S. AALLEN seem to suggest, but it belongs to the image of God's kingship. In other words: the Temple is the 'Palace' where the heavenly King dwells and exercises his kingship. Or, the Temple is the community because and in so far as God is in her midst.
- 2 T. W. MANSON, Teaching, p. 120.
- 3 The words, 'for those who trust in riches' are rejected as a gloss; cf. OAB, ad loc., and T.W.MANSON, Teaching, p. 119, n.1.
- 4 Note the parallel expressions 'Not every one ...' Mt vii.21a // 'Every one ...' 24a; the tenor of this introduction is foreign to the Sermon. Cf. T. W. MANSON, Sayings, p. 60: 'There are few sadder words in the New Testament than Lk. 6.46, and all the pathos has gone in the version given by Mt.'
- 5 So also H. WINDISCH, Eingehen, p. 165
- 6 So, e.g., R. BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 150.

The different forms of the 'entry-sayings' have now become intelligible: First, in Mt vii. 13-14 - and, as we shall see later, in the authentic Sermon on the Mount - the idea of the Temple which must be entered now is clearly and consciously present. Because of the relation between the concept of Yahweh's kingship (kingdom) and His Temple in the cult, Jesus began to use the convenient expression 'to enter the kingdom' in the latter part of his ministry. During his whole ministry the kingship - in part - was thought to be manifested in the community of his disciples, who expected its impending consummation. In the latest stratum of the synoptic tradition, however - after A.D. 70 - the conception of a Temple as a place which must be entered seems to have been no longer associated with the concept of the kingdom, which by then was understood wholly in a futuristic way.

The development sketched here, namely from a present to a purely futuristic or, in other words, from a cultic to an apocalyptic understanding of the kingdom, is supported by the observation made by J. W. BOWMAN, namely that the stem *bsr* is abandoned completely in later Syriac to denote the New Testament gospel message. 'It is tempting', he says, 'to accept the third possibility and to suggest tentatively that it was the apocalyptic interest of the second-century church that led it to abandon a stem (*bsr*) with its intrinsic stress on the gladsome element in the Christian gospel because of what had already occurred through Jesus Christ (and lay, therefore, in the past) and in its place to employ the stem *sbhr* ... with its reference to the future eschatological hope.'<sup>1</sup>

Over against the view of the final redaction of Matthew - and thus of the early Church after A.D. 70 - the view of Jesus himself perhaps can best be expressed by the term suggested by J. A. T. ROBINSON, namely: 'inaugurated eschatology'.<sup>2</sup> The kingdom of heaven, we found in our provisional discussion, was inaugurated during the Galilean period of Jesus' ministry on the Sermon on the Mount. Inaugurated - so that men, as Jesus used to say later, actually could 'enter' it - 'yet only inaugurated'.

After this discussion, we may return to E. LOHMEYER's question, namely: '... where in the Gospel tradition do we find any words which could be taken to indicate the birth of a new cult?'<sup>3</sup> By now it has become probable that the answer indeed is: in the (authentic) Sermon on the Mount. Of course, we

---

1 J. W. BOWMAN, art. cit. (see above p. 59, n.1), p. 65.

2 Cf. J. A. T. ROBINSON, Coming, p. 101.

3 Cf. above p. 207.

cannot expect complete originality of the new cult over against the established temple cult. The basic structure is likely to be the same. The new emphasis, moreover, to a certain extent already was contained in the prophetic conception of the 'remnant'.<sup>1</sup> This most probably is the vital point. Whereas entrance into the Temple of Jerusalem was granted to Jewish members of the processions in corpore, the new cult of Jesus only knows the individual initiation into the Temple // kingdom of God, and that after the conditions of admission proclaimed by Jesus on the Mount of the Sermon are fulfilled.<sup>2</sup>

The question now arises, if the Sermon on the Mount implies the birth of a new cult, how did Jesus conceive of the relation between this new cult and the Temple of Jerusalem? The three passages which contain a direct reference to the Temple and - according to Matthew - belong to the Galilean period, i.e. to the 'beginning' in a wider sense, are Mt v.23f., viii.4 par., and xii.5,6.

The opening words of Mt v.23, i.e., 'So if you are offering your gift at the altar...', presupposes both the existence of the temple cult and the practice of private offerings.<sup>3</sup> The decisive point of the passage is 'that transgression against a neighbour cannot be atoned for cultically, as long as conversion and reconciliation have not yet taken place.'<sup>4</sup>

According to Mt viii.4 // Mk i.44 // Lk v.14 Jesus charged the cleansed leper, 'See that you

1 Cf. T. W. MANSON, *Teaching*, p. 177: 'Membership in the nation came by accident of birth; in the Remnant it is a matter of deliberate choice by the individual.' However, according to the synoptics (cf. Mt iv. 18 par., etc.) and esp. to John xv.16, the choice of the disciples was Jesus' own.

2 Cf. H. WINDISCH, *Meaning*, p. 27: 'This saying (sc. Mt v.20) determines the character of all the subsequent teaching. The laws, which are contrasted with the inadequate legalism of Moses or the rabbis, are thereby characterized as conditions of admittance. Just as access to the altar and participation in the cultus in the Temple at Jerusalem were hedged about by definite cultic and ethical conditions (the most familiar catalogues are in Ps. 15 and 24), so also the kingdom of heaven opens its doors only to those who meet the prescriptions for admittance as revealed by Jesus. All the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount, therefore, is meant to summon men to exert themselves to the utmost to obtain entrance to the Kingdom of God; it is conditioned in its entirety by eschatology. It is a proclamation from the lips of Jesus of the rules of admittance as God has determined them.' - Although WINDISCH points the way to the right interpretation of the Sermon, the findings of redaction criticism (cf. above p. 44/45) show that he bases his understanding on a redactional formulation (i.e. v.20) and on the second wholly futuristic understanding of the kingdom.

3 Cf. R. HUMMEL, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

4 *ibid.*, p. 80; cf. also T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 156.



say nothing to anyone; but go, show yourself to the priest, and offer (for your cleansing, Mk, Lk) the gift that Moses commanded, for a proof to them.' We note that Jesus explicitly demands the observance of the law contained in Lev xiv.2ff. The term 'proof', or, 'testimony' (μαρτύριον) points to Jesus' intention that the priest<sup>1</sup> by testifying on the healing testifies to Jesus' authority.<sup>2</sup> Thus in both cases the Temple of Jerusalem is accepted without any criticism.

The third saying, however, seems to point in a different direction: 'I tell you, something greater than the temple is here' (Mt xii.6, no par.). R. BULTMANN holds the verses 5-7 to be a secondary scriptural proof which penetrates the dialogue Mt xii. 1-8 par.<sup>3</sup> And even ADOLF SCHLATTER judges Mt xii.6 to be a confession of the Church of Matthew. 'This saying', he says, 'makes visible how richly blessed the Church felt. She is incomparably richer than Israel. If she turns away from Temple and altar she abandons that which guarantees for Israel the presence of God and the forgiveness of sins.'<sup>4</sup> Thus we have to do here with a Christological expression which perhaps was coined after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem: In Christ we have more than in the (now abandoned) temple cult. 'The inner process of severing of the early Christians', SCHRENK comments on Mt xii.6, 'here already is completed.'<sup>5</sup> We must conclude, then, that this saying does not convey the view of Jesus during his ministry in Galilee.

The result of Jesus' ministry at the end of the Galilean period is indicated by the passage Mt xi.20-24 // Lk x.13-15: the Woes on the cities of Galilee, i.e. on Chorazon, Bethsaida and Capernaum. RODERIC DUNKERLEY is right in saying, 'Now, the intense disappointment expressed in this passage requires an equally strong hope and expectation at an earlier date, and of this we find plenty of evidence in the early stage of the narrative. It is found in the frequent references to "preaching good news" (Mark 1:14;etc.),

---

1 Cf. G. SCHRENK, art. ἱερεὺς, in: TWNT III, p. 264, n.23: A cleansed leper had first to present himself to a local priest before he went to Jerusalem.

2 So G. SCHRENK, *ibid.*, p. 264; cf. also R. HUMMEL, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

3 See R. BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 49.

4 A. SCHLATTER, Die Kirche des Matthäus, (BFT) Gütersloh 1929, p. 31; cf. also *ibid.*, p. 33: 'For Christ brings his people into the kingdom of God and makes it the perfect community which is cleansed from evil, the people of God baptized in the Spirit.'

5 G. SCHRENK, art. τὸ ἱερόν, in: TWNT III, p. 244.

in the anticipation of the light being given "unto all that are in the house" (Matt. 5:15), and in the bright happy atmosphere of the wedding feast (Mark 2:19).<sup>1</sup> We believe that Jesus' hope sprang not only from 'His conviction of the nearness of the kingdom of heaven',<sup>2</sup> but from the actual inauguration of the kingdom on the Mount of the Sermon. There and then an 'offer of divine blessing' (cf. the Beatitudes) had been received,<sup>3</sup> and that through God's eschatological coming on His Way back to Mount Zion.

In the light of this possibility - which will be demonstrated in the following two chapters - the real significance of the Sending Out of the Twelve (Mt x parr., i.e. between the Sermon and the Woes) is revealed. Its purpose is '... to make ready for the Lord a people prepared' (Lk i.17d),<sup>4</sup> or, in other words, the gathering of the people of Israel unto the Lord. This interpretation is supported by two sayings, namely (1) by the immediate introduction to the Sending Out, "Then he said to his disciples, "The harvest is plentiful, but the laborers are few; pray therefore the Lord of the harvest to send laborers into his harvest" (Mt ix. 37,38; Lk x.2).<sup>5</sup> The fact that Jesus uses the image of the harvest for the gathering of the people is not surprising.<sup>6</sup> (2) The (for Gentile Christians) embarrassing saying Mt x.5-6 (cf. Mt xv.24), which seems to have been omitted both by Mark and by Luke for this reason, also supports our interpretation: '... "Go nowhere among the Gentiles, and enter no town of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." ' This is not an expression of Jesus' nationalistic<sup>7</sup> but rather of his eschatological view: all nations will be gathered unto the Lord at the 'end'.

Even if Mark and Luke omit the saying reported in Mt x.5,6, however, the Sending Out exclusively to Israel still is implied in the choice of the 'Twelve'. Consequently Luke, who realised this, we believe,

---

1 R. DUNKERLEY, The Hope of Jesus, A Study in Moral Eschatology, London 1953, p. 51.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 51.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 53: 'But such an expectation implies that an offer of divine blessing had been made to the people and that the imminent prospect of its being received had been proclaimed.'

4 Cf. above p. 57.

5 Cf. R. DUNKERLEY, *ibid.*, p. 52: 'The absence in all these texts of any hint of a long-postponed harvest in the distant future must be marked; that is an unfortunate marring of the ideas based on the interpretation of the Parables of the Tares (Matt. 13:39), which is probably not primitive material.'

6 See above p. 126; (cit. EDERSHEIM)

7 So J. KLAUSNER, Jesus, p. 258.



invented the Sending Out of the 'Seventy' (cf. Lk x.1-16), which signifies that Jesus' message was meant not only for the whole of Israel, i.e. the 'Twelve Tribes', but also for all nations (cf. Gen x).<sup>1</sup> The sayings contained in Lk x.2-12 suggest that Luke makes use here of the same traditional materials as Matthew in his Sending Out of the Twelve. Furthermore, Mk vi. 7-13 - which is taken over by Lk in Lk ix.1-6 - supports the view that the primitive tradition spoke of a sending out of twelve disciples.

The primary message entrusted to the Twelve, i.e. 'The kingdom of God is at hand' (Mt x 7; cf. Lk ix.2), shows that the disciples share in Jesus' own message (cf. Mt iv.17), namely: 'the gospel of the kingdom' (cf. Mt iv.23). If we are right in assuming that the character of the Sermon on the Mount is that of 'learnt gospel', this implies that on their mission the Twelve make use of what they have learnt on the Mount. In this connection it is worth noting that the term *ἐγγίσειν* (Heb. = *qrb* and *ngsh*, cf. Ex iii.5; Lev xxi.21; Ezek xl.46) can be used also in the cultic sense of 'drawing near to God' (cf. *ἐγγίσει μεν τῷ θεῷ*, Heb vii.19).<sup>2</sup> Over against this, the 'gospel of the kingdom' speaks of God's drawing near to man, an idea which most probably is derived from the cultic epiphany of God as King.<sup>3</sup> Against this cultic background we may understand the enigmatic details contained in Jesus' charge to the Twelve, namely, 'Take no gold, nor silver, nor copper in your belts, no bag for your journey, nor two tunics, nor sandals, nor a staff; ...' (Mt x.9.10; cf. Lk x.4). Mark tried to make this charge more reasonable by saying, '... nothing ... except a staff; ... but to wear sandals ...' (cf. Mk vi.8,9).<sup>4</sup> It has been recognised for a long time that the prohibitions imply a reference to the Temple.<sup>5</sup> 'It is possible,' T. W. MANSON says, 'that the mission of the disciples is meant to be regarded

1 On the meaning of the number 70 see, e.g. F. RIENECKER (ed), *Lexikon zur Bibel*, (2nd ed.) Wuppertal 1960, col. 1556, c. R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p. 334, is right in describing Lk x.1 as an editorial introduction. See however, T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 74.

2 Cf. H. PREISKER, art. *ἐγγύς*, in: *TWNT II*, p. 330.

3 See above pp. 93ff.

4 Cf. T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 180/81: Things prohibited / allowed.

5 See A. EDERSHEIM, *Temple*, p. 65.



as a specially sacred undertaking, and that they are to set out upon it as if they were setting out to worship in the Temple.<sup>1</sup> According to our hypothesis, we may interpret those details as follows: they suggest that the Twelve not only have to announce God's coming but also that they already have experienced His coming on the Mount, and now are inviting the people of Israel to join God in His return to His Temple on Mount Zion.<sup>2</sup>

We think that R. DUNKERLEY touches the decisive point in connection with the Woes, which belong chronologically towards the end of the Galilean period, when he says, 'But, the chance of all this<sup>3</sup> and much more was lost "because they repented not", Jesus said. By repentance, he meant of course not merely sorrow for past sin, but a radical turning round into a new allegiance to God and a real acceptance of the way of life to which he calls.'<sup>4</sup> We may add here: this way of life is the 'Way of the Lord' Who is about to return to Zion. Its content - as we shall demonstrate in the following two chapters - is contained in the Sermon on the Mount.

---

1 T. W. MANSON, Sayings, p. 181.

2 Cf. J. KLAUSNER, Jesus, p. 314: 'The solemn warnings against entering even the "Temple-Mount with sticks or bags or dusty feet" and against spitting there, to which the "Tosefta" adds a warning against entering "with coins tied up in handkerchiefs" (the Jerusalem "Talmud" says "our Rabbis took off their shoes under the outer gate of the Temple-Mount") - ... "Thus the explanation Mt x.10b, 'for the laborer deserves his food,' although it is quite early (cf. 1 Tim v.18), nevertheless seems to be secondary. The authentic reason for the charge, we believe, is the symbolism which points to the Temple-Mount.

3 DUNKERLEY's own reference is to 'power to survive, to be purged from corrupting evil, and to resist decay and defeat whatever Herod or Rome might say or do' (cf. *ibid.*, p. 53/54).

4 R. DUNKERLEY, Hope, p. 54.

## 2 On the Way

Whereas there is little doubt that the Sermon on the Mount marks the beginning of the Way, the limits of the middle part, i.e. 'On the Way', are more difficult to recognise. We already have mentioned in the introduction to the present chapter that Luke begins this period after the first two Predictions of the Passion, i.e. from ix.51 (CONZELMANN), and expands it considerably with special materials over against the other synoptics. G. STRECKER has suggested that the  $\lambda\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$  in Mt xvi.21 marks a new period in the life of Jesus, viz. 'the way to suffering'.<sup>1</sup> In this matter, then, the views of Luke and of the final redaction of Matthew are about the same. Do they reflect the actual situation of the ministry of Jesus? T. W. MANSON, who describes Peter's Confession as 'the watershed of the Gospel history', seems to affirm this question when he says, 'Indeed it is not too much to say that Peter's inspired declaration at Caesarea Philippi has changed the whole course of the world's history. At all events it is the dividing line between two sharply contrasted, yet complementary, periods in our Lord's activity.'<sup>2</sup>

If Jesus' ministry is patterned after the 'Way of the Lord', MANSON's division into two periods needs qualification. Not only the second period but the whole time from the inauguration of the kingdom on the Mount onwards is 'a period of harvest and ingathering of men for the Kingdom.'<sup>3</sup> - as the Sending Out of the Twelve shows. However, the result of the harvest and ingathering was extremely disappointing (cf. Mt xi.20-24 par.). Moreover, other difficulties arose, 'And Jesus went away from there (sc. Galilee) and withdrew to the district of Tyre and Sidon' (Mt xv.21; cf. also Mt xiv.13). The reason for this withdrawal seems to be twofold, namely: (1) the failure of the cities of Galilee (cf. Mt xi.

---

1 See G. STRECKER, *op. cit.* p.92.

2 T. W. MANSON, *Teaching*, p. 210.

3 MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 210, holds this to be characteristic for the second period, whilst the first was 'a time in which Jesus was sowing the word of the Kingdom.' We would place the time of sowing before the Sermon. Even if we exclude the Sermon as evidence for the outline of Jesus' ministry (cf. *ibid.*, p. 97), Mt ix.37,38 par. speaks against Peter's Confession being the point which marks the beginning of the time of harvest (*ibid.*, p. 210).

20-24 par.), including Nazareth (cf. Mt xiii. 53ff. par.) to respond adequately to Jesus' and his disciples' proclamation of the kingdom, and (2) the growing opposition by worldly (cf. Mt xiv. 1ff. par.) and religious (cf. Mt xv. 1ff.) authorities. Although Jesus and his disciples are 'on the way' from Mt xv. 21 onwards, it is quite clear that we have to do here with an intermezzo rather than with the Way in the theological sense of the 'Way of the Lord'.

What did Jesus do at the time of his withdrawal outside Galilee, during the intermezzo?

'... it seems natural', R. DUNKERLEY says, 'to find that he made strong efforts to keep away from crowds, to prevent excitement, and to avoid controversy (Mark 7:24, 33, 36; 8:13, 23, 26, 30), for as I have suggested the time had come to prepare for the difficult future, and he needed solitude both for personal communion and for training the Twelve.'<sup>1</sup> In this context, we believe, 'his disciples' (cf. Mt xvi. 13) are not the particular group of the Twelve but all the followers who were willing to join the Way. The fact that Jesus concentrated on their teaching suggests that 'they were not fit, not spiritually equipped for the work to which Israel was summoned.'<sup>2</sup> We may assume that at this stage Jesus deepened and expanded his teaching on the Mount. It is from this point of view, we believe, we have to understand the passage Mt xvi. 13ff., and from the pattern of the Way.

If we approach the crucial verse Mt xvi. 18 while keeping the pattern of the Way in mind, we recognise at once that it does not speak about the 'founding of a Church' in its Christian connotation, but rather about the gathering together of the people of God.<sup>3</sup> After the leading question of Jesus, "But who do you say that I am?" (vs. 15), 'Simon Peter replied,

"You are the Anointed,"<sup>4</sup>

the Son of the living God."

And Jesus answered him,

"Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jona:

For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you,

but my Father who is in heaven.

---

1 R. DUNKERLEY, *Hope*, p. 75.

2 *ibid.*, p. 75.

3 Cf. A. RICHARDSON, *Theology*, pp. 307 and 310; RICHARDSON does not show the difference clearly enough, esp. when he says that 'Jesus conceived of his divinely appointed mission as that of creating the Church' (p. 307).

4 We should avoid inserting here our own 'Christology', as well as that of the evangelists, but rather should try to leave room for contemporary associations.



And I tell you, you are Peter (  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omicron\varsigma$  , Aram=Kepha<sup>1</sup> ),

and on this rock (  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\alpha$  , Aram=kepha<sup>2</sup> ) I will build my  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$  ,  
and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." (Mt xvi.16-18)

We omit here Mt xvi.19, because the parallel in Mt xviii.18 - the phraseology of which is rabbinic<sup>2</sup> - , makes it doubtful whether or not it originally belongs here. R. HUMMEL, from the point of view of the final redaction of Matthew, says, 'Doubtless vs.19 is to interpret vs.18, which is not intelligible in itself, by explaining in which function Peter is the rock, on which the congregation of the Messiah is built. Hence vs. 19 must indicate that function of Peter which is fundamental for the Church and makes her unshakable against the powers of death.' In view of the rabbinic parallels and the fact that Peter most probably was no longer alive when the final redactors of Matthew were at work, HUMMEL arrives at the conclusion, 'that Matthew probably understood the terms "bind" and "loose" to denote the authority of the scribe, which includes both the power to teach and to exercise discipline, and that he points in xviii.18 to the latter and in xvi.19 to the former.'<sup>3</sup>

Consequently, Mt xvi.16-18 may not be interpreted from vs.19, if we try to find the authentic meaning of this passage. On the other hand, Mark's point of the story, namely Peter's protest<sup>4</sup> (cf. Mk viii.32,33, omitted by Lk) perhaps is not the original one either. Following the approach suggested above, we may argue: Although we must take into account the aspect of revelation (cf. vs. 17), Peter's Confession certainly is not independent of his experience as a disciple, and especially of the teaching of Jesus. As there is no evidence whatsoever that Jesus revealed himself in words as 'Anointed', the only possible explanation is that he acted as such and, moreover, that his teaching implied a specific conception of Messiahship. This is indeed suggested by the form of Peter's Confession reported in Matthew: "You are the Anointed, namely: the Son of the living God."

1 Cf. O. CULLMANN, *Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr* (ET) London 1953, p. 185; and O. CULLMAN, art.  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\alpha$  , in: *TWNT VI*, p. 98.

2 Cf. T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 205; W. D. DAVIES, *Setting*, p. 225; and A. RICHARDSON, *Theology*, pp. 317 ff.

3 R. HUMMEL, op. cit., p.61 (first cit.), and p. 62; cf. also O. CULLMANN, art.  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omicron\varsigma$  , in: *TWNT VI*, p. 107/08.

4 So CULLMANN, *ibid.*, p. 104, n.27.

"The living God", J. KLAUSNER explains, 'is quite an Hebraic expression, and to term the Messiah "son of the living God" is justifiable from the verse in the Psalm: "Thou art my son: this day have I begotten thee," since, a few verses earlier, it is said, "Against the Lord and against his anointed (his Messiah)".'<sup>1</sup> This is very interesting because - as we have seen - the voice from heaven at the baptism of Jesus also contains an allusion to Ps ii. 7. Mt xvi.17 suggests that Jesus did not tell his disciples about that 'anointment oracle' at this stage.<sup>2</sup> However, they had learnt already the teaching about divine sonship contained in the Sermon on the Mount, to which we shall return later. Therefore we may assume that not only Peter himself but also the other disciples knew what he was speaking about when he said, "You are the Anointed, namely: the Son of the living God."

The view that the term 'Son of God' is original in Peter's Confession is supported by the expression 'my Father' in Jesus' answer. CULLMANN says, 'Jesus' answer to Peter in Matt. 16.17 "flesh and blood has not revealed to you (that I am the Son of God)", must be counted as one of his declarations about his being the Son of God. Here we see again the strict reserve with which Jesus speaks of his deepest secret, and now we understand better why the name "Son of God" occurs to very seldom as his self-designation.'<sup>3</sup>

KLAUSNER says, referring to 'the recognition of the messianic claims at Caesarea Philippi', 'A great event happened then. Jesus was deeply affected to find that, even in his present evil plight, his disciples had not despaired and that, despite their obtuseness, some of them recognized him as the Messiah. It may have been then that, in his happiness, Jesus uttered those wonderful words: "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them to babes (in understanding)." The three Synoptics are, however, unanimous in

---

1 J. KLAUSNER, *Jesus*, p. 299; on Ps ii and its concept of sonship see above pp.115 ff. The fact that the term 'Son of God' is lacking both in Mark and Luke may be explained in this way: at the time when they wrote their Gospel, they felt that it was no more necessary to define Jesus' conception of Messiahship. Matthew, who is more conservative in the matter of terminology, may have retained the original version of Peter's Confession. (Luke's 'The Christ ... of God' looks like its rudiment.) On Mark's attitude in this question see however O. CULLMANN, *Christology*, p. 294.

2 We shall presently see where Mt xi. 27 actually belongs; Mt xiv.33 seems to be editorial.

3 O. CULLMANN, *ibid.*, p. 286; however, we cannot follow CULLMANN's (cf. *ibid.*, p. 280) and J. BIENECK's (cf. *Sohn Gottes*, p. 50, n.15) contention that the blessing of Peter refers to Jesus' sonship only and not to his Messiahship. The connection between the two concepts occurs already in Ps ii and was not 'made first by the evangelists' (CULLMANN, *ibid.*, p. 279).

recording that Jesus forbade his disciples to tell any one what they had learned: place and time was yet unsuitable.<sup>1</sup>

KLAUSNER's hypothesis about the original place of Mt xi.25f. is quite reasonable.<sup>2</sup> Admittedly, Matthew as well as Luke, and thus the common source, insert the passage immediately after the Woes on the cities of Galilee. However, this fact can be explained by the natural desire of the early Church to contrast the failure implied in the Woes with Jesus' great happiness about the growing comprehension of the inner circle of his disciples. And it is more plausible that this comprehension was the result of Jesus' concentrated effort at instructing his disciples 'on the way' (cf. Mk viii.27) in a foreign land.

Moreover, we note that the ending of the third strophe of Mt xi.25f. fits the beginning of Mt xvi.24f., i.e. of the passage which is parallel again in all three synoptics, and thus most probably belongs to the primitive tradition:<sup>3</sup>

Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me,  
for I am gentle and lowly in heart,  
and you will find rest for your souls,  
for my yoke is easy, and my burden is light. (xi.29-30)  
If any man would come after me, let him deny himself  
and take up his cross and follow me. (xvi.24)

Some years ago ERICH DINKLER discussed the expression 'to take up his cross' and considered the possibility that 'the Yoke of the Kingdom' could be its origin.<sup>4</sup> In this case, he said, 'My yoke must be seen as that which in unity with the proclamation of the kingdom, or even with the beginning of its coming into existence, must be accepted as the new and easy yoke.'<sup>5</sup> Although DINKLER himself rejected this possibility,<sup>6</sup> this interpretation, we believe, is in keeping with Jesus' conception of Messiahship.

1 J. KLAUSNER, *Jesus*, p. 300.

2 For a discussion of this passage see below, VIII.3.

3 This, we believe, is the case neither with Mk viii.3-31 nor with 32-33. The latter may be explained in connection with Mark's tendency to emphasize the lack of understanding on the part of the disciples (cf., e.g., vi. 52, viii.17,18).

4 E. DINKLER, *Jesu Wort vom Kreuztragen*, in: *NT Studien* für R. BULTMANN, 1954, pp. 111 ff.

5 *ibid.*, p. 116.

6 See however, J. KLAUSNER, *ibid.*, p. 302: "The words recorded at this stage: "let him deny himself and take up his cross," must be regarded as a later addition: crucifixion was not a Jewish mode of death, and Jesus, the Galilean, could not have used such a figure of speech since Galilee did not then possess a Roman Procurator and Jewish legal processes were still in force there."



T. W. MANSON says concerning the latter, 'The Messiah is the person who realises the Kingdom by utter obedience to God's will, by voluntary identification of his will with God's. The Kingdom on earth manifests itself as the society of all those who follow the Messiah and take upon themselves the yoke which he bears.'<sup>1</sup>

The 'society of all those who follow the Messiah' in Mt xvi.18 is designated as ἐκκλησία. It is well known that this term is used in Matthew in one other saying only, namely in xvii.17,<sup>2</sup> and that it is missing in Mark and Luke altogether. Whatever the Hebrew or Aramaic equivalent might be,<sup>3</sup> the corresponding verb καλέω is found in Mt iv.21 and ix.13 par.: 'And going on from there he (sc. Jesus) saw two other brothers, James the son of Zebedee and John his brother ... and he called them (ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς).' - '... For I came not to call (καλέῃσας) the righteous, but sinners.' Thus K. L. SCHMIDT points the way to the right interpretation when, referring to the Damascus Rule (the Scrolls were not yet found by then) and to the concept of the 'remnant', he says that Mt xvi.18 denotes a 'pars pro toto-process', or, in other words, means nothing more than the process of singling out and collecting the circle of Jesus' disciples.<sup>4</sup> This links up with our hypothesis that Jesus conceived of his mission as that of gathering together the people of God.

On the other hand, it is surprising that in 1 and 2 Peter the term ἐκκλησία is missing.<sup>5</sup> However, the verb οἰκοδομήσω found in Mt xvi.18 suggests that in 1 Peter ii.4-8 we have to do with a reminiscence of the former: 'Come to him, to that living stone (λίθον), rejected by men but in God's sight chosen and precious; and like living stones be yourselves built into a spiritual house (οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικός), to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. For it stands in scripture:

1 T. W. MANSON, *Teaching*, p. 211.

2 Cf. A. RICHARDSON, *Theology*, p. 307: in Mt xviii.17 the term means 'nothing more than the local congregation (so RV mg.), a particular gathering of his followers'.

3 K. L. SCHMIDT, art. ἐκκλησία, in: *TWNT III*, p. 529/30, suggests k<sup>e</sup> nishta', a term which in Syriac versions translates both ἐκκλησία and συναγωγή.

4 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 530.

5 So also K. L. SCHMIDT, *ibid.*, p. 505.

"Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone,  
a cornerstone chosen and precious,  
and he who believes in him  
will not be put to shame," (cf. Is xxviii.16)

To you therefore who believe, he is precious, but for those who do not believe,

"The very stone which the builders rejected  
has become the head of the corner,"

and "A stone that will make men stumble,  
a rock that will make them fall;"

for they stumble because they disobey the word, as they were destined to do.'

Admittedly, this passage is difficult to use as evidence for the original meaning of the equivalent of ἐκκλησία, because the images used in it are very mixed. However, the quotation from Is xxviii.16 makes it reasonable to think that the 'spiritual house' denotes the 'spiritual temple'. The Septuagint as a rule uses 'house' (οἶκος) for the Temple of Jerusalem,<sup>1</sup> and to this corresponds the expression in Mt xii.4, 'the house of God' (οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ), which here denotes the tabernacle. As the Hebrew equivalent is byt hmqdsh, and the Aramaic byt mqdsh,<sup>2</sup> we may regard οἶκος πνευματικός as a literal translation.

If we recall the way the term 'house' is used in the Dead Sea Scrolls,<sup>3</sup> it is not impossible to assume that the authentic form of Mt xvi.18 read as follows:

And I tell you, you are Peter,  
and on this rock I will build my 'House' (οἶκον // byt),  
and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.

In this case we may assume that the early Church, by changing the term 'House' into 'ekklēsia', identified herself with that 'House'.<sup>3</sup> This change would indeed be reasonable, for after A.D. 70 the authentic expression was no longer relevant. For it depicts Jesus as the builder of a Spiritual Temple.

However that may be with the equivalent of ἐκκλησία, JOACHIM JEREMIAS has recognised long ago that Mt xvi.18 implies the image of the Temple. '... thus,' he says, 'Peter as bearer of

1 Cf. G. SCHRENK, art. τὸ ἱερόν, in: TWNT III, p. 232.

2 See above pp. 179f.

3 The statement in 1 Tim iii.15, which seems to contain reminiscences of Mt xvi. 18, perhaps influenced the change of the term: 'the house of God (οἶκον θεοῦ) ... is the church (ἐκκλησία) of the living God, the pillar and bullwark of the truth.'

revelation on the rock, on which the new Temple of the Messianic saving community is erected.<sup>1</sup> OTTO BETZ arrived at a similar conclusion: 'Mt xvi.18 and Mk xiv.58 belong together, for the ekklesia to be erected on the rock too is the living Sanctuary of the last days, exactly as the "Sod" in 1 QH vi.26. This eschatological community now already is pre-formed in a circle of persons which gathers around a man and his teaching, knowing that they are bound under his yoke (1 QH v.24; Mt xi.29).'<sup>2</sup>

The statement by BETZ suggests that the future tense, οἰκοδομησώ, is not to be taken too strictly in connection with the historical Jesus;<sup>3</sup> the Spiritual Temple first is pre-formed and then completed at a later stage. We shall try to show later that in the Sermon on the Mount we have to do originally with the laying of the foundation of the Spiritual Temple. Thus Mt xvi.18 points not to a new beginning of Jesus' work but rather to his continuing of his original mission, which will be completed only on God's return to Mount Zion. Mt xvi.27, 28 expresses this hope as follows: 'For the Son of man is to come with his angels in the glory of his Father, and then he will repay every man for what he has done. Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.'

Of course, we cannot discuss here the complex and difficult problems connected with Jesus' use of the concept of the 'Son of Man'. Although T. W. MANSON's understanding of this concept has not met with much approval,<sup>4</sup> as far as we can see it is in accordance with the view of the historical Jesus: 'His mission is to create the Son of Man, the Kingdom of the saints of the Most High, to realise in Israel the ideal contained in the term. This task is attempted in two ways: first by public appeal to the people through the medium of parable and sermon and by the mission of the disciples: then, when this appeal produced no

1 J. JEREMIAS, Jesus als Weltvollender, (BFT, Vol.33) Gütersloh 1930, p. 62.

2 O. BETZ, Felsenmann und Felsengemeinde, Eine Parallele zu Mt 16.17-19 in den Qumranpsalmen, in: ZNW 48, 1957, p. 60. ("Sod" = building)

3 See however A. RICHARDSON, Theology, p. 308: 'the true ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ would come into existence when he, the Son-of-Man-Servant-Messiah, had ratified the new covenant in his own blood. Jesus is saying that St. Peter will be the foundation-stone of the spiritual house (cf. I Pet.2.5) which, through the making of a new covenant was to take the place of the old Israel and its Temple, an idea which has been preserved in another form in the Fourth Gospel (John 2.19-21; cf. 4.20-24).'

4 Cf. A. J. B. HIGGINS, Son of Man - Forschung since 'The Teaching of Jesus', in: NT Essays, pp. 119ff.



adequate response, by the consolidation of his own band of followers. Finally, when it becomes apparent that not even the disciples are ready to rise to the demand of the ideal, he stands alone, embodying in his own person the perfect human response to the regal claims of God.<sup>1</sup>

The development of the 'Son of Man' sketched by MANSON is parallel not only to the actual historical development we are trying to follow in the present chapter, but also to that of the concept of the 'Suffering Servant' in Deutero-Isaiah,<sup>2</sup> namely: from the 'many', i.e. the whole people of Israel, via the 'few', i.e. the disciples, the 'remnant', to the 'one', i.e. the individual Son/Servant of God (= King-Messiah),<sup>3</sup> or, the ideal 'Son of Man'. As the central idea of this development is that of 'representation',<sup>4</sup> the three stages are by no means mutually exclusive: consequently, the 'many', the 'few' and the 'one' must always be kept in mind. There are reasons to believe, moreover, that the actual development is the exact opposite of the ideal one originally conceived by Jesus, namely: From 'the Son of God (Baptism) via the few 'sons of God' (Sermon on the Mount) to the many 'sons of the kingdom', i.e. of God (Mt viii.11,12). However, the many 'did not repent' (Mt xi.20).

It is decisive for the understanding of the original meaning of Mt xvi.18 that Peter's Confession and Jesus' answer belong to the middle stage of the development. This implies above all: at this stage there is no question of Peter being the 'one'; consequently it is very unlikely that in this context

---

1 T. W. MANSON, *Teaching*, p. 227/28; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 211 ff: 'The Son of Man'.

2 See J. MORGENSTERN, *Suffering Servant*, p. 426, n. 1: Deutero-Isaiah 'conceived of his Servant of Yahweh only as the people, Israel, and not at all as an individual personality as does our drama.' The drama, which is a 'Jewish sectarian document' and 'must be dated after 485 B.C.', depicts the Servant as a martyred king of Israel (cf. *ibid.*, p. 427/28).

3 T. W. MANSON does not seem to realise that the concept of the 'Son of God' expresses the idea of representation too, and belongs together with 'Servant' (Cf. *Teaching*, p. 227, and esp. *The Servant-Messiah*, A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus, (Paperback) Cambridge 1961, over against, e.g., O. CULLMANN, *Christology*, p. 283).

4 Cf. O. CULLMANN, *ibid.*, p. 54/55: 'It is thus actually characteristic of the central theological idea of the "ebed Yahweh" hymns (that is, the idea of representation) that a plurality is progressively reduced as an always decreasing minority takes over the task which was originally that of the totality. I have tried to show in my book *Christ and Time*, (pp. 115ff.) how the biblical "Heilsgeschichte" unfolds from beginning to end according to the principle of representation in a progressive reduction: the way proceeds from the whole creation to humanity, from humanity to the people of Israel, from the people of Israel to the 'remnant', from the 'remnant' to a single man, Jesus.'

he is given a special commission (cf. Mt xviii.18).<sup>1</sup> Jesus asked his disciples and Peter replied in their name (vs. 13,16): the 'few' are in the centre. Peter is declared by Jesus to be the kepha, i.e. the foundation-rock on which he is building his 'Temple'. The importance of the foundation-rock is emphasized by Jesus already in the well-known parable Mt vii. 24-27 par.: Every one who hears these words of mine and does them will be like a wise man who built his house ( οἰκοῦν ) upon the rock ( πέτρῳ ); ...<sup>2</sup> These words, as the whole of the Sermon on the Mount, are addressed to the disciples. 'The rock', T. W. MANSON says, 'is "hearing and doing." The teaching is heard, and accepted, and becomes a firm conviction issuing in action. Such solid conviction makes a stable foundation; ...'<sup>3</sup> If we may understand Mt xvi.18 against this background, it is probable that Peter's 'conviction' expressed in his Confession is the reason why he is given the name Kepha,<sup>3</sup> and that his Confession is based on and reflects the previous teaching of Jesus, especially that given on the Mount. From the moment Peter confessed Jesus to be 'the Son of the living God', all disciples shared in this revelation, and consequently Jesus thanks his Father for revealing 'these things' to the disciples (cf. 'to babes', Mt xi.25 par.) and not to Peter alone.<sup>4</sup> A. RICHARDSON is right in pointing out in this context, 'Elsewhere in the NT the apostles and prophets are collectively said to be the foundation upon which is built the household of God, and Christ is the corner-stone (Eph.2.20; cf. 1 Pet. 2.6f.; Rev.21.14); or

1 Cf. T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 205: 'The grant of exclusive power to Peter is inconsistent with Mt. 18.18, where the same powers are given to the whole body of disciples. Of the two Mt xvi.19 is less likely to be original.'

2 T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 61; the rest of the sentence reads, 'it gives unity and consistency to life.'

3 See however A. RICHARDSON, *Theology*, p. 309: '... Jesus says he will build his Church, not on the Messiahship that Peter confessed, ... but quite simply on St. Peter himself.' Consequently, RICHARDSON holds Mt xvi.18 to be 'a prophecy, and one which came true: upon Simon Peter and his labours the existence of the Church in its early days seems to have quite literally depended, if the matter is viewed from a purely human point of view.' This is in line with O. CULLMANN's conjecture that Peter's Confession properly belongs to the passion sayings of Jesus (cf. CULLMANN, *Peter*, pp. 182f.) and with CULLMANN's detailed interpretation in his art. πέτρῳ, in *TWNT VI*, pp. 99-112. In our opinion, CULLMANN's and RICHARDSON's interpretation reflects too much the interpretation of the early Church, which perhaps is hinted at by vs. 19a. T. W. MANSON is right in saying, 'It is one thing to be the foundation and quite another to be the ruler of the New Israel. And it may be added that if the phrase Kingdom of God means anything, it means that God is sole ruler of the New Israel.' (*Sayings*, p. 203)

4 For our interpretation of the 'babes' see below, p. 363.

again in another place Christ is declared to be the only foundation of the Church (I Cor. 3.11; cf. Isa. 28.16).<sup>1</sup>

Before we turn to the so-called 'Transfiguration', we have to say something about the aspect of suffering, which according to all synoptics belongs to the context of Peter's Confession.<sup>2</sup> However, Matthew and Luke in this perhaps follow Mark and not the primitive tradition. The exact point of the Prediction of the Passion is important, we believe, because it marks the point where Jesus and his disciples went to Jerusalem, i.e. again joined the 'Way of the Lord' to Zion. We assume that Mk viii.31 par. is a secondary construction of the Church,<sup>3</sup> and that the Passion is first predicted only after the Transfiguration. However, Mark's introductory words in viii.31 point to an interesting fact, namely: Jesus seems to have spoken about the suffering of the Son of Man (cf. Lk ix.22; Mt xvi.21; 'he' = Jesus). This is supported by the (perhaps first and) certainly authentic prediction found after the Transfiguration, namely Mt xvii.12, 'but I tell you that Elijah has already come, and they did not know him, but did to him whatever they pleased. So also the Son of Man will suffer at their hands.' To this we may compare the Second Prediction Mk ix.31 par., 'The Son of Man will be delivered into the hands of men,' to which Matthew and Mark add details but not Luke (cf. ix.44). Mark and Luke proceed to say that the disciples 'did not understand the (this, Lk) saying, and they were afraid to ask him.' (Mk ix.32) What was the authentic understanding of the 'Passion of the Son of Man'?

The following statement by T. W. MANSON, we believe, points the way to the right interpretation:<sup>4</sup>

'This at once suggests that what was in the mind of Jesus was that he and his followers together should share that destiny which he describes as the Passion of the Son of Man; that he and they together should be the Son of Man, the Remnant that saves by service and self-sacrifice, the organ of God's redemptive purpose in the world. - In our records one at least of the disciples - Peter - is represented as offering to go with Jesus even to death; and his enthusiasm carries the others with him.' (Cf. Mk xiv.26-31; Lk xxii.31-33). This interpretation is in accordance with the middle stage, and it is unlikely that Jesus at this stage

---

1 A. RICHARDSON, Theology, p. 309.

2 See J. KLAUSNER, Jesus, p. 300, for some reasons for this to be historical.

3 So also R. BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 152.

4 T. W. MANSON, Teaching, p. 231; the ref. is to the fact that 'discipleship is synonymous with sacrifice and suffering and the cross itself, 'which corresponds to the 'Son of Man' predictions.



spoke exclusively of his own suffering. Nevertheless we believe that Jesus understood himself to be the (Son-)Servant from the time of his baptism. This implies that the idea of suffering in his mind was not merely an after-thought but present from the beginning of his mission. The interpretation that the disciples should share the mission and suffering of Jesus is supported also by Jesus' question to James and John in Mk x. 38b; 'Are you able to drink the cup that I drink, or to be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized?' After the disciples' affirmation, 'We are able,' Jesus adds the - at the time of his death unfulfilled - prediction, 'The cup that I drink you will drink; and with the baptism with which I am baptized, you will be baptized ...' (Mk x.39; omitted by Mt). It is worth noting that in the following discussion Jesus clearly refers to the Suffering Servant (Mk x.45 par.; cf. Is liii. 10-12).<sup>1</sup> The previous context of this well-known saying suggests that at this stage the 'Son of Man' still is understood by Jesus collectively.<sup>2</sup>

The three synoptics are unanimous in recording the *Transfiguration* (Mt xvii.1-8 // Mk ix.2-8 // Lk ix.28-36) after Peter's Confession.<sup>3</sup> If this literary sequence reflects a historical one, and we believe that this is the case, it is reasonable to look for the 'high mountain apart' (Mk ix.2 par.) in the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi. J. KLAUSNER perhaps is right in identifying it not with Mount Tabor,<sup>4</sup> but with 'Hermon, which is comparatively near to Caesarea Philippi, and whose summit is covered with perpetual snow.'<sup>5</sup> We may add here that - according to K. GALLING<sup>6</sup> - on the top of this mountain there was an ancient sanctuary.

As to the literary problems of the Transfiguration, R. BULTMANN is right in saying, 'The story is by no means an unity, even if we cannot make a literary analysis with complete certainty.'<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless we believe that it reflects an historical event the essence of which still is discernible in the synoptic tradition.

1 So J. JEREMIAS, art. *πολιεύς*, in: *TWNT VI*, p. 545.

2 In Mk xiv.24 par. however, Jesus reveals to his disciples that he alone is to take upon himself the role of the Suffering Servant.

3 Our conjecture is that Mt xvi.13-18 + xi.25-30 + xvi.24-28 originally belongs together and reflects one historical scene.

4 As a Christian tradition which still is current in the Eastern Church suggests, see below, p. 236, cit. LOSSKY.

5 J. KLAUSNER, *Jesus*, p. 303.

6 See K. GALLING, art. 'Berge, heilige,' in: *RGG I*, Col. 1044.

7 R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p. 260; cf. also *ibid.* n.5, and the interpretation of the Transfiguration by HEINRICH BALTENSWEILER, *Die Verklärung Jesu*, Zürich 1959.

Perhaps it is not by chance that chapter ix in Mark begins with a reference to the coming of the kingdom of God in power: 'Theodotus,' T. W. MANSON says, 'followed by other patristic interpreters, regards the prophecy as fulfilled when the three intimate disciples were present at the Transfiguration about a week later.'<sup>1</sup> Another explanation is that the prophecy was fulfilled in 'the coming of the Spirit', i.e. 'when the day of Pentecost had come' (Acts ii.1ff.).<sup>2</sup> MANSON raises the following objections against these two interpretations: 'In detail it can be argued against the Transfiguration as the fulfilment of this prophecy that it does not account for the similar saying in Mk. xiv.62. The High Priest and his party certainly did not see the Transfiguration ... Against the identification of the coming of the Kingdom with the outpouring of the Spirit and the astonishing progress of Christianity in the first century is to be set the fact that the people who lived through these great events did not make the identification.'<sup>3</sup>

MANSON, of course, is right if he identifies 'the coming of the Kingdom of God in power' with the final consummation of the kingdom, which obviously happened neither on the Mount of Transfiguration nor on the day of Pentecost.<sup>4</sup> But is this identification really necessary? TH. DE KRUIJF, who judges from the point of view of the final redaction of Matthew, suggests, 'On the whole the interpretation of the Transfiguration as an anticipated Parousia, as the coming of the Son of Man in glory, is most convincing.'<sup>5</sup> We touch here the problem discussed in J. A. T. ROBINSON's book mentioned already above, namely: 'Is the origin of the "Parousia" doctrine to be found in his (sc. Jesus') own teaching?'<sup>6</sup> ROBINSON says in connection with Jesus' use of the language of apocalyptic, 'But, however much or little he used of the language, it is the underlying assumptions that are decisive, and these I believe Jesus had far more in common with the Prophets

1 T. W. MANSON, *Teaching*, p. 279; cf. *ibid.*, n. 2.

2 *ibid.*, p. 279; cf. n.5.

3 *ibid.*, p. 281.

4 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 282: 'The conclusion thus appears to be that Jesus expected the consummation of the Kingdom to take place at some time in the immediate future, and that this expectation was not realised.'

5 TH. DE KRUIJF, *Der Sohn*, p. 89.

6 J. A. T. ROBINSON, *Coming*, p. 36; cf. also T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 283/84: 'From a theological point of view it may be argued, therefore, that the important question is not whether Jesus was correct in his dating of the Parousia, but whether he was right in his description of its nature; or rather, whether the picture which he gives is one which present-day theology is prepared to accept and embody in its teaching.'

than with the Apocalyptic writers. - His concern was with the present moment, with the crisis introduced into history by the advent of the Kingdom of God, at work proleptically in his ministry and shortly to be "fulfilled" in his death and vindication.<sup>1</sup> On the whole, we agree to this statement. Our hypothesis that the b a s i c underlying assumption of Jesus was the 'Way of the Lord', and consequently that over against an apocalyptic stands a cultic understanding of the kingdom, however, points to a somewhat different understanding of the present manifestation and the future fulfilment of the kingdom of God. If we may interpret the sayings about the Son of Man in Mk viii, 38b, ix. 1 // Mt xvi. 27, 28 // Lk ix. 26, 27 in accordance both with our previous understanding of the kingdom and with MANSON's understanding of the Son of Man, two points are of importance in view of a possible proleptic fulfilment of the prophecy contained in them in the event of the so-called Transfiguration: (1) Jesus expects the coming of the 'Son of Man', i.e. the new people of God, and (2) the 'Son of Man' will come 'in the glory ( δόξα ) of the (Mk, Mt: 'his')<sup>2</sup> Father', and not in his own glory.

HARALD RIESENFELD's main thesis about the Transfiguration, namely that it 'is related directly to the Jewish feast of Tabernacles',<sup>3</sup> points the way to the right interpretation of this event, i.e. to a c u l t i c interpretation. However, RIESENFELD does not seem to recognise the central cultic experience of that festival when he concludes, '... the Transfiguration contains a manifestation of the Messianic glory of Jesus already in the course of his earthly life. This manifestation however does not imply a complete and definite entronement, as we could show by way of a Christological scheme, the importance of which for the doctrine of the New Testament we underlined.'<sup>4</sup>

1 J. A. T. ROBINSON, Coming, p. 97.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 54, concerning the 'his': '... it represents God as the Father of the Son of Man (equating, by implication, the titles "Son of man" and "Son of God"), in a manner unparalleled either in Jewish usage or in that of primitive Christianity.' ROBINSON concludes from this usage that the whole expression 'cannot safely be regarded as belonging to the original words of Jesus' (*ibid.*, p. 56). Our view is that the equation at this stage reflects the view of the historical Jesus: in the Sermon on the Mount the disciples are designated as 'sons of God' and here as the 'Son of Man'. However, the word 'his' most probably is secondary and points to an individual interpretation. When Jesus identifies himself with the Son of Man, as in Mt xxv. 34, he says, 'in my Father'. Mt xxv. 31-46, we believe, is Jesus' description of the final consummation of the kingdom. (See however, ROBINSON, *ibid.*, p. 55, n. 1)

3 H. RIESENFELD, Jésus Transfiguré, p. 304.

4 *ibid.*, p. 303; (see above p. 74, n. 3, crit. MOWINCKEL).



The central cultic experience of the feast of Tabernacles is seen correctly by ETHELBERT STAUFFER, when he says, 'The temple in Jerusalem is the place where God is present. The great temple feasts are therefore in the deepest sense feasts of the divine self-revelation, feasts of theophany, at which the crowds of pilgrims gathered from all over the world experience the presence of God. This is true above all for the great pilgrim feast in the autumn, the feast of Tabernacles.'<sup>1</sup> If RIESENFELD's main thesis is correct, then, we must conclude that the essence of the Transfiguration is a theophany, i.e. a manifestation of the glory of the Father in the circle of Jesus and his three most intimate disciples.

Over against this, we believe, original emphasis the interpretation of the synoptics is Christocentric.<sup>2</sup> 'Thus', W. D. DAVIES says, 'the Transfiguration looks forward in Mark both to the Passion and the Resurrection.'<sup>3</sup> ... In any case not as "Mosaic" teacher but as suffering and triumphant Lord, does Mark present Jesus in the Transfiguration.'<sup>3</sup> Matthew's account seems to be more near to the historical event in that he links the Transfiguration with the earthly ministry of Jesus. We may mention here the following observations made by DAVIES: 'One fact only concerns him, that on the face of Jesus is seen the glory of the mediator of the Law, Moses ...' (cf. Mt xvii.2); 'he has the Shekinah in mind, that presence of the Lord which used to fill the tabernacle in the wilderness' (cf. vs. 5 'bright'); 'Mark and Luke look back mainly to Ps. ii.7, whereas Matthew here, as in the account of Jesus' baptism, refers both to Ps. ii.7 and Isa.xlii.1 ...'<sup>4</sup> Matthew 'is concerned not primarily with the Passion motif after the Transfiguration, but with the "teaching" of Jesus ... The "Hear ye him" of xvii.5 both looks backward to v-vii and forward to xvii.5-xviii.35.'<sup>5</sup> He places the 'awe' felt by the disciples after the appearance of the 'bright cloud' and the voice from it, 'And it is such "awe" as fells them to the ground: in token of their veneration they fall on their faces to the earth, as was

1 E. STAUFFER, Jesus and His Story (ET), London 1960, p. 142; cf. also above p. 94.

2 See however H. BALTENSWELER, op. cit., who - following Mark - holds the Christo-centric interpretation to convey the emphasis of the historical event.

3 W. D. DAVIES, Setting, p. 51; cf. R. BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 259: 'It has long since been recognized that this legend (sc. the Transfiguration) was originally a resurrection story.' This interpretation clearly is based on Mark's emphasis.

4 *ibid.*, p. 52.

5 *ibid.*, p. 53.

customary in epiphanies.<sup>1</sup> Finally DAVIES says, 'The Mount of Transfiguration thus recalls the Mount from which Jesus proclaimed the Sermon in v-vii, and to this extent supports the interpretation of the Jesus of the Mount as a New Moses and a greater.'<sup>2</sup>

If the essence of the Transfiguration originally was a theophany, how can we explain the introduction of Moses and Elijah into the scene? The fact that Moses is mentioned also by Mark suggests that the earlier tradition already contained a reference to the 'Moses-Prophet type', for his emphasis does not lie there.<sup>3</sup> This implies that this typology was only elaborated but not introduced by the final redaction of Matthew. But is it authentic? It is worth noting that in Mark - and thus perhaps also in the earlier tradition - priority of significance is given to Elijah.<sup>4</sup> This figure most probably stems from the context after the Transfiguration, namely '... I tell you that Elijah has already come' (Mt xvii.12 par.), where it is identified with John the Baptist. This identification is supported by Mt xi.14, and may reflect the view of the historical Jesus. As Elijah 'has already come', and that in the person of John, it seems unlikely that his appearance originally was part of the scene on the Mount. As to Moses, he does not seem to fit into the authentic picture either. 'It is doubtful', BULTMANN says, 'whether the legend of Exod.24 has had any effect; the six days are explicable here and there from the tradition (see above); the three trusted friends do not there accompany Moses to the theophany itself, and the cloud is known to be a traditional form of a theophany.'<sup>5</sup>

The interpretation of the Transfiguration as a theophany is in accordance with a tradition of the Fathers that is still living in the Eastern Church. VLADIMIR LOSSKY says, referring to the teaching of St. Gregory Palamas, 'The light seen by the apostles on Mount Tabor is proper to God by His nature: eternal, infinite, existing outside space and time, it appeared in the theophanies of the Old Testament as the glory of God - a terrifying and unbearable apparition to created beings, because foreign and

---

1 W. D. DAVIES, Setting, p. 54; the ref. is to Gen xvii.3; 1 Sam xxiv.9; 2 Sam ix.6; Dan x.9.

2 *ibid.*, p.61; when A. RICHARDSON, Theology, p. 182, says, 'The mount of Transfiguration is, of course, the new Sinai; ...' he follows the secondary interpretation of Matthew. (cf. the following cit. from BULTMANN on this p.)

3 So W. D. DAVIES, *ibid.*, p. 50.

4 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 51.

5 R. BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 260.

external to human nature as it was before Christ and outside the Church.<sup>1</sup> The following quotation from St. Gregory Palamas is of special interest, because it links the experience of the disciples to the teaching of Jesus on the Mount of the Sermon: 'He who participates in the divine energy, himself becomes, to some extent, light; he is united to the light, and by that light he sees in full awareness all that remains hidden to those who have not this grace; thus, he transcends not only the bodily senses, but also all that can be known by the intellect ... for the pure in heart see God ... who, being Light, dwells in them and reveals Himself to those who love Him, to His beloved.'<sup>2</sup>

We believe that Matthew historically is right in linking the Transfiguration to the Sermon and - with the common tradition - to the Baptism of Jesus. If the epiphany of God at the Jordan marked out Jesus as the King-Messiah and - as mentioned already - if the Sermon on the Mount we have to do with the laying of the foundation of the Spiritual Temple, of which Jesus is the builder (cf. Mt xvi.18), what is the significance of the theophany on the Mount of Transfiguration? Perhaps we may understand this particular coming of God - as well as against the background of the feast of Tabernacles - from the scene described in 1 Kgs viii.10,11: 'And when the priests came out of the holy place, a cloud filled the house of the Lord, so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud; for the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord.' This is to say, the event on the Mount of Transfiguration signifies the dedication of the 'Spiritual Temple' - represented by the circle of Jesus and his most intimate disciples - through a 'legitimizing theophany'.<sup>3</sup>

At this point, the question must be asked again, this time concerning the middle period: What was Jesus' view at this stage of the relation between the 'Spiritual Temple' and the Temple of Jerusalem? We try to find an answer in the passage Mt xvii.24-27 (no par.), which contains the only

---

1 V. LOSSKY, The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church (ET) London 1957, p. 222/223; cf. *ibid.* p. 223, n. 1.

2 *ibid.*, p. 224; cf. n.2. In this cit. we recognise a ref. to Mt. v 8,14.

3 Cf. above p. 100; we shall see below that the Sermon on the Mount most probably presupposes as its central part a theophany. If this is correct, the theophany on the Mount of Transfiguration is a confirmation of the former one, after the failure of the people to join the coming God. Our contention that the 'Spiritual Temple' is a present reality (at least) from the Transfiguration onwards, is supported also by the following observations: '... the first occurrence of the phrase "enter into the Kingdom of God" is in the period which lies between the transfiguration and the beginning of the journey to Jerusalem.' (T. W. MANSON, Teaching, p. 120).



direct reference to the Temple of Jerusalem of all passages belonging to the stage 'on the Way'. In spite of the 'legendary motif' of vs. 27b,<sup>1</sup> there are reasons to believe that the brief dialogue between Peter and Jesus and the introduction vs. 24 are authentic.<sup>2</sup> The opening words, 'When they came to Capernaum,' show that Jesus and his disciples are 'on the way' (cf. also Mk ix.33), perhaps from the district of Caesarea Philippi (cf. Mt xvi.13 par.) 'through Galilee' (Mk ix.30) to Jerusalem. When we recall that most probably Peter's dwelling-place is Capernaum (cf. Mt viii.14), it seems entirely natural that - after his absence abroad - 'the collectors of the half-shekel tax went up to Peter and said, "Does not your teacher pay the tax?" (vs.24)' When Peter 'came home', i.e. into his house (cf. Mk ix.33: 'in the house'), where Jesus and his disciples were staying, Peter discussed the problem with Jesus. Jesus' argument for their freedom from the Temple tax, namely that the disciples (and Jesus himself) are 'sons', i.e. sons of the heavenly King, 'sons of God', is in accordance with Jesus teaching on the Mount and certainly authentic.<sup>3</sup>

"Then the sons are free" (vs.26) - this suggests that the sonship of the disciples is a present reality. Furthermore, as the tax is used for the temple cult,<sup>4</sup> freedom from the tax implies that the 'sons' do not need that cult any more as a matter of principle. This is in accordance with our contention that at this point the 'birth of a new cult' already had taken place: the circle of Jesus and the disciples represent the New Temple which was dedicated on the Mount of Transfiguration, and the foundation of which was laid on the Mount of the Sermon. In order 'not to give offense to them' (the collectors), however, Jesus - thus we may reconstruct vs.27 - told Peter, "take a shekel and give it to them for me and for yourself."

---

1 Cf. R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, pp.35,218; ('a secondary consideration').

2 We cannot see why the introduction which contains the ref. to the temple tax should be secondary over against the dialogue vss.25f. (BULTMANN, *ibid.*, p. 34). On the contrary, this ref. most probably is why the whole passage was omitted both by Mk and Lk: the temple tax was no problem for their readers. For Mt's view see R. HUMMEL, *op. cit.* p. 104f. (freedom from the Temple itself).

3 Cf. R. BULTMANN, *ibid.*, p. 35: 'If it turns out that the members of the Church are the "sons", that is but in keeping with the eschatological consciousness of the earlier days.'

4 Cf. R. HUMMEL, *ibid.*, p. 104.

For the Temple tax was a confession of allegiance to the Temple of Jerusalem,<sup>1</sup> and its refusal would signify not only separation from the Temple but also from the cult community, i.e. from the people of God.<sup>2</sup>

Thus the views expressed in the passage on the Temple Tax are entirely in accordance with the basic pattern of the 'Way of the Lord': Jesus and his disciples are 'on the Way' as 'the sons', i.e. the 'sons of God', the true 'sons of the kingdom'. Their 'coming' is the proleptic coming of the 'Son of Man', i.e. the new people of God, 'in the glory of the Father'.<sup>3</sup> In a form analogous to the cultic theophany, God in his glory came to dwell in the midst of them on the Mount of Transfiguration, and thus confirmed the previous teaching of 'the Son' and promised His presence 'on the Way' to Mount Zion. Luke has preserved a saying of Jesus which explicitly testifies to the presence of God as King in connection with the disciples on the Way, namely Lk xvii, 20-21: 'Being asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God was coming, he answered them, "The kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed; nor will they say, 'Lo, here it is:' or 'There:' for behold, the kingdom of God is among you" (*ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν ἔστιν*).'<sup>4</sup> The kingdom is 'among' the Pharisees in the form of the 'few', the disciples, who are its present manifestation.

It might be objected that what we present here is an 'over-interpretation' of the passage of the Temple Tax. This is right to a certain extent; however, this interpretation is justified by our following cultic interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount, which from a historical point of view should be put before that of the Temple Tax. As it would exceed the limits of our study, we must refrain from discussing the further Way to Zion as evident from the synoptics and proceed immediately to its last stage.

1 Cf. R. HUMMEL, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

2 Cf. A. SCHLATTER, *op. cit.*, pp. 13ff.

3 See above p. 234, esp. n. 2 (equation of the titles 'Son of Man' and 'Son of God').

4 On the difficulties and the various interpretations of this saying see T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, pp. 303ff. Over against MANSON's preference of the interpretation 'the answer is known to God alone', we hold that the saying essentially points to the presence of the Kingdom. (cf. *ibid.*, p. 304) - Our interpretation suggested above will be clear only after our discussion of the Sermon, from which we shall be able to conclude that Jesus for his disciples only re-interprets God's kingship in terms of His Fatherhood. Thus, we believe, Jesus would have said to his disciples: Behold, the Father Himself is in the midst of you. This is in accordance with the pericope of the Temple Tax: the disciples are 'the sons'. Cf. also J. JEREMIAS, *Unknown Sayings of Jesus (ET)*, London 1957, p. 15: the Gnostic re-interpretation of Lk xvii, 20-21 contains a ref. to 'sons of the Father'.

### 3 Returned to Mount Zion

In connection with the 'final stage', R. DUNKERLEY draws attention to the Lament before entering the city, Lk xix. 41-44. 'The word "visitation"', he says, referring to vs. 44, 'is very significant. It and the corresponding verb "visited" are frequently found in the Old Testament of God's approach to and dealings with men ... It seems legitimate, therefore, to draw two inferences from the use by Jesus of the word here; first, that he had a strong sense of a unique relationship with God which entitled him to speak thus as his vicegerent, and second, that through him a supreme effort had been made by God to enlighten and redeem his people.'<sup>1</sup> If Lk xix. 41-44 is a 'vaticinium ex eventu'<sup>2</sup> it is nevertheless important as Luke's interpretation of the Entry. His formulation suggests that the rejection of the One who is coming by Jerusalem is inevitable. This, we believe, was not the view of Jesus at this stage: his intention still is to gather together the people as God's chosen agent of salvation, as the authentic Lament over Jerusalem in Mt xxiii. 37-39 par. shows.

We may add here that the concept of visitation is found also in Qumran Apocalyptic. 'It looked forward', M. BLACK says, 'to a final Visitation (peqqudah) or Judgment (mishpat) in which there would be a divine purification of mankind. ... This new Creation of eternal duration appears to have its location on this earth, for the restoration of the Temple in a New Jerusalem seems to have been an integral part of their expectations of the new age.'<sup>3</sup>

The last stage of the Way is introduced by the synoptics with the story about the securing of an animal for Jesus to ride on (cf. Mt xxi. 1ff. par.). BULTMANN a priori denounces this to be a 'fairy-tale motif', for which we cannot see any reason.<sup>4</sup> However, the present formulation of the story perhaps is secondary

---

1 R. DUNKERLEY, Hope, p. 84; cf. also p. 83.

2 So R. BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 36; (we agree to this).

3 M. BLACK, Scrolls, p. 171.

4 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 261; (BULTMANN's reason seems to be his well-known contention that Jesus' life and work was not Messianic, cf. *Theology*, pp. 26ff.).



in that it contains a prophecy of Jesus about the place where the disciples will find a colt tied. Nevertheless we must reckon with the possibility that the historical Jesus actually entered Jerusalem mounted on an ass. In this case, Matthew's scriptural reference most probably points to Jesus' own understanding of his symbolic act:

Tell the daughter of Zion,  
Behold, your king is coming to you,  
humble and mounted on an ass,  
and on a colt, the foal of an ass. (Mt xxi.5; cf. Zech ix.9)

Zech ix.10 shows that the king mentioned in Matthew's quotation is the Prince of Peace:

I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim  
and the war horse from Jerusalem;  
and the battle bow shall be cut off,  
and he shall command peace to the nations;  
his dominion shall be from sea to sea,  
and from the River to the ends of the earth.

To Zech ix.9,10 we may compare Is lxii.10-12:

Go through, go through the gates,  
prepare the way for the people;  
build up, build up the highway, clear it of stones,  
lift up an ensign over the peoples.  
Behold, the Lord has proclaimed  
to the end of the earth:  
Say to the daughter of Zion,  
"Behold, your salvation comes;  
behold, his reward is with him,  
and his recompense before him."  
And they shall be called The holy people,  
the redeemed of the Lord;  
and you shall be called Sought out,  
a city not forsaken.

The background to Zechariah's prophecy is the solemn procession in which the newly anointed king, most probably riding on a mule (cf. 1 Kg i.33), was brought to the royal palace, an event which usually took place on the Enthronement festival.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See above p. 116 (cf. S. MOWINCKEL, He That Cometh, p. 64); and above p. 120.

The following two statements also seem to point to the possibility that the Entry may be understood from the ancient concept of enthronement: (1) 'There are two critical points in the last phase; and they are, in my view, linked to the two great Jewish festivals: the Cleansing of the Temple at the Feast of Tabernacles and the Crucifixion of the Messiah at the Feast of Passover.'<sup>1</sup> (2) 'And the report of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem with a crowd of pilgrims full of joy and expectation (at the kingdom of God that was now coming) could provide the historical basis which became a Messianic legend under the influence of Zech. 9.9.'<sup>2</sup> This is to say, if the Entry actually happened at the Feast of Tabernacles, of which - according to S. MOWINCKEL - in ancient Israel 'enthronement' was a prominent aspect,<sup>3</sup> it is reasonable to think that Jesus consciously took the part of the Anointed of Yahweh, i.e. in ancient Israel the earthly king, and that the pilgrims recognised him as such.<sup>4</sup>

The acclamation of the pilgrims, too, is in keeping with the Feast of Tabernacles: "Hosanna! Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord! Blessed is the kingdom of our father David that is coming! Hosanna in the highest!" (Mk xi.9,10; cf. Mt xxi.9; Lk xix.38).<sup>5</sup> It is evident, then that some of the pilgrims recognised and proclaimed Jesus as the King-Messiah and expected the restoration of the kingdom of Israel. However, it must be remembered that the emphasis of the ancient Enthronement Festival, and thus most probably of Jesus himself, was on the kingship of Yahweh,<sup>6</sup> and His universal dominion.<sup>7</sup>

As to the relation between the entry into Jerusalem and the entry into the Temple, the synoptics do not agree exactly with each other. Matthew and Luke, on the one hand, link the two scenes closely together by placing them on the same day. On the other hand, Mark's report, which places the second scene on the following day, seems to bear the stamp of authenticity: 'And he entered Jerusalem, and went into the temple; and when he had looked around at everything, as it was already late, he went out to Bethany with the twelve' (Mk xi.11). R. DUNKERLEY is right in saying, 'it would be easy to defend the Marcan arrangement as giving

---

1 T. W. MANSON, Servant Messiah, p. 81.

2 R. BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 262.

3 For its contemporary features see above pp. 125ff.

4 Hence it was not the ass only (cf. BULTMANN, *ibid.*, p. 261/62) but the whole context of the festival and its ancient tradition which points in this direction.

5 Cf. J. KLAUSNER, Jesus, p. 310; (the psalms too belong to Tabernacles).

6 See above p. 146.

7 See above p.100.

him the opportunity to survey the position and to decide on the details of the operation.<sup>1</sup>

Whether or not the two events happened on the same day, as a matter of content they are closely knit together. 'It was not enough', DUNKERLEY says, to offer the kingdom - it was necessary also to show the nature of the kingly rule and godly way of life which he knew ought to be established on earth.<sup>2</sup> Hence we may assume that the Entry and the Cleansing of the Temple (cf. Mt xxi. 12-13 // Mk xi. 15-19 // Lk xix. 45-48) not only were a demonstration of Jesus' Messianic mission,<sup>3</sup> but also a manifestation of the nature of the kingdom of God Who is coming.<sup>4</sup>

Thus we agree with those who hold the Cleansing to be the decisive moment in Jesus' public life.<sup>5</sup> As to the interpretation of this event, the opinions differ widely. J. KLAUSNER stresses the aspect of public demonstration: '... they entered the Temple and there Jesus, with the help of his followers and some of the people, drove out the traders from the Temple-Mount, ... Both the act and the sentiment gained the approbation of the people; but the priests were enraged. ... Jesus and his disciples were satisfied with what they had accomplished in, or near, the Temple: they had aroused popular indignation against their leaders, they had won popular approval and created an impression.'<sup>6</sup>

The decisive question is, of course: What kind of impression was created by Jesus on the people of Jerusalem? T. W. MANSON answers, 'The essential point is that the Messiah, instead of clearing the Gentiles out of the Holy City, bag and baggage, makes his first public act the vindication of Gentile rights in the Temple itself. For the part of the Temple that was cleansed was the Court of the Gentiles, the only

---

1 R. DUNKERLEY, Hope, p. 87.

2 *ibid.*, p. 86.

3 So Y. M. - J. CONGAR, Temple, p. 123; cf. R. H. LIGHTFOOT, The Gospel Message of St. Mark, Oxford 1952, ad. rem.

4 Cf. G. GLOEGE, *op. cit.*, p. 261: 'In other religions, also, a king's entry into power was linked with the ritual cleansing of the Temple. The Babylonian New Year festival and the Hellenistic myth of the Emperor regarded the cleansing of the Temple as the omen of a new era. There is a lot to be said for the supposition that Jesus, by what he did ... aimed to break the particularism of the theocracy and declare the Temple a universal place of prayer, as a late prophecy had promised would happen in the last days (Isa. 56.7).'

5 Cf. CONGAR, *ibid.*, p. 123; E. F. SCOTT, The Crisis in the Life of Jesus, New York 1952.

6 J. KLAUSNER, Jesus, p. 315/16.



place to which non-Jews had access to worship the God of Israel; and when Jesus cleared away the Jewish traders and businessmen, the porters and messengers, he was clearing a space for the Gentiles. This was certainly not in accordance with the accepted Messianic programme.<sup>1</sup>

The context of Is lvi. 7, whence the expression 'a house of prayer for all the nations' (Mk xi. 7a) is derived, makes it clear that the quotation does not imply the exclusion of Jewish worshippers:

Thus says the Lord God,  
who gathers the outcasts of Israel,  
I will gather yet others to him  
besides those already gathered. (Is lvi. 8)

God's community, already in Old Testament times, includes both Israel and proselytes.<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand, Matthew and Luke omitted the words 'for all the nations' (cf. Mt xxi. 13 // Lk xix. 46). R. HUMMEL explains this from the point of view of Matthew as follows: 'Thus his point is the characterization of the Temple as a house of prayer, not its significance for the Gentiles.'<sup>3</sup> Does this reflect the emphasis Jesus himself placed on Is lvi. 7? It is more probable, we believe, that Matthew and Luke omitted the reference to the nations at this place because they speak in another context about the mission of the Church to the nations, namely in Mt xxviii. 16-20 and Lk x. 1ff. respectively.

The following two statements by J. JEREMIAS, which to a certain extent are in line with MANSON's opinion quoted above, most probably define the view of the historical Jesus correctly: 'Jesus states explicitly that he prepares for the nations the place of worship. The eschatological hour has come: the profaned sanctuary is cleansed; God comes to his Temple. Here the renewal of Israel begins, which will be completed

1 T. W. MANSON, *Servant Messiah*, p. 83; cf. also *ibid.*, p. 36: 'It is from this point of view of the fundamental contradiction between the Jewish Messianic hope and Jesus' convictions concerning his own Ministry that the Gospel story becomes, in its main lines, an intelligible piece of history.' On the other hand - and this is the main emphasis of our present study - Jesus' hope to a great extent is in accordance with the hiero-centric religion of ancient Israel as reflected mainly in the Psalms and the Prophets. Of course, this has become much more clear since the discovery of the Scrolls (cf. *ibid.*, p. 11, n. 4) which in some points contain views not unlike to those of Jesus.

2 Cf. *OAB*, ad loc.

3 R. HUMMEL, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

when the nations stream through the gates open day and night to the House of God in order to worship.<sup>1</sup> 'The people of Israel as the bearer of the promise (Mt viii.12: οἱ τῆς βασιλείας) has the first right to the offer of salvation. This, however, does not necessarily imply that Jesus shared in the opinion of his contemporaries about the priority given to Israel.<sup>2</sup> The last sentence of this second statement may be qualified as follows: On the one hand, Jesus seems to have rejected the absolute priority of Israel,<sup>3</sup> but on the other hand it is quite clear that he knew himself to be sent to Israel in the first place (cf. Mt x.5,6; xv.24). It is probable that Jesus differentiates between two successive stages, namely A. Israel; B. the nations. During the first stage - which in the present context included his whole actual ministry - Jesus' task is to build a 'Spiritual Temple', and that - as evident from the Cleansing - in the sense of a restoration and renewal of the Temple on Mount Zion to its eschatological function as a place where the new mankind meets and worships God. We may conjecture that the connection between the two stages was thought of by Jesus like this: By preparing the 'Way of the Lord' in Israel, i.e. by gathering this people, by cleansing its sanctuary, Jesus at the same time 'prepares for the nations the place of worship'.

JEREMIAS, if we understand him correctly, mentions God's coming to his Temple as a result of its cleansing. Both the Transfiguration and the Feast of Tabernacles suggest that Jesus does not regard God's coming as identical with his own as His vicegerent but expects a final theophany on Mount Zion. For the latter, of course, the initiative is entirely in God's hand. As we shall see below, the final theophany most probably marks the actual beginning of the second stage.<sup>4</sup>

What was wrong with the present Temple is shown by Jesus in the quotation from Jer vii.11: 'But you have made it a den of robbers' (Mk xi.17b; cf. parr.). The context in Jeremiah, namely The Temple Sermon, suggests what the issue of the Cleansing, or restoration of the Temple is: 'A complete moral change

---

1 J. JEREMIAS, *Jesu Verheissung für die Völker*, Stuttgart, 1956, p. 56.

2 *ibid.*, p. 41.

3 Cf., e.g., Mt xxii.43; for an expression of absolute priority see J. KLAUSNER, *Jesus*, p. 285: 'The kingdom of heaven was for Israel along; only afterwards should the Gentiles "be added to the house of Jacob" ...'

4 See below p. 251; (cit. JEREMIAS).

was required.<sup>1</sup> Consequently we find Jesus teaching 'every day' (Lk xxi.37) in the Temple, perhaps during a period of some six months.<sup>2</sup> To this Messianic function the redaction of Matthew adds another one, namely that of healing (Mt xxi.14-16). We have here a clear parallel to the editorial passage Mt xv.29-31, where Jesus is depicted as 'healer on the Mount'.<sup>3</sup>

R. DUNKERLEY holds that Mk xi. 27-33 parr. was originally associated with the Entry and the Cleansing:<sup>4</sup> 'After his dramatic entry into the city and his high-handed action in the Temple, the authorities obviously had to challenge him or lose face with the people. Hence we find them coming with their demands for his credentials, so to speak.'<sup>5</sup> The counter-question put by Jesus to the hierarchy is not merely evasive, for there is a real connection between the question of the authority by which Jesus is doing 'these things' and John the Baptist: John is Elijah in the view of Jesus (cf. Mt xi.4; xvii.12-13 par.). As we have seen above, John saw in Jesus the eschatological figure mentioned in Mal iii.1f., whilst Jesus passed it back to John.<sup>6</sup> In Mal iii.1 we read that after the preparation of the Way by the messenger = Elijah (cf. Mal iv.5) = John, 'the Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to his temple.' We may assume that the word 'baptism' in Mk xi.30 parr. stands for the whole ministry of John, i.e. his preparation of the Way. If the hierarchy denies that John was appointed by God, it would be useless to tell them that Jesus cleansed the Temple by divine authority, which would imply that he is the Messiah,<sup>7</sup> for they could reject this claim by pointing out that 'first Elijah must come' (cf. Mt xvii.10).

Thus the situation presupposed by the passage about the Question of Authority to a certain extent is parallel to the discussion about the Coming of Elijah Mt xvii.10-13 par. This is to say, after the experience of God's coming on the Mount of Transfiguration, the disciples asked Jesus, 'Then why do the scribes say that

---

1 OAB, ad loc.

2 So T. W. MANSON, Servant Messiah, p. 79; (this suggestion is based on an article of his in the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, cf. *ibid.*, p. 78).

3 Cf. above pp. 48, n.3; 53.

4 Cf. R. BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 20, n.2: 'Favouring this is perhaps the fact that in Jn. 2.13-22 the (admittedly transformed) question of authority is directly linked with the Cleansing of the Temple.' Yet BULTMANN finds this association questionable.

5 R. DUNKERLEY, Hope, p. 88.

6 See above pp. 56f.

7 See below p. 250; (cit. HUMMEL).



first (i.e. before the Lord and his Anointed) Elijah must come?'. After the final preparation of God's coming to his Temple, Jesus himself asked the hierarchy, in other words, 'What is your view about John, is he Elijah who has already come?'. To answer this question in the affirmative would, at least, leave open the possibility that Jesus is the Messiah. 'So they answered Jesus, "We do not know." (Mk xi.33 par.)'<sup>1</sup>

The end of Jesus' Messianic teaching in the Temple is marked by two passages which are highly significant, namely The Lament over Jerusalem (Mt xxiii. 37-39; cf. Lk xiii. 34-35) and the Prediction of the Destruction of the Temple (Mt xxiv.1-3 par.). The first passage is similar in content to the one reported in Lk xix.41-44, i.e. the Lament which Luke placed before the entry into Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup> In our opinion, such a Lament fits well into the situation towards the end of the final period, after Jesus' long activity in the Temple.<sup>3</sup> Jesus' description of his activity in Mt xxiii.37 par. is entirely in accordance with what he was doing from the beginning in Galilee, namely gathering the people unto the Lord, in order to prepare His Way: 'How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under his wings, and you would not.'

Furthermore, it is probable that 'your house' in vs.38 par. is an ironical expression that denotes the Temple which is 'forsaken' namely by God, and therefore the whole city is forsaken.<sup>5</sup> Matthew adds 'and desolate': the reference is to Jer xxii.5, 'But if you will not heed these words, I swear by myself, says the Lord, that this house (sc. the house of the king of Judah, cf. xxii.1) shall become a desolation.' Perhaps this addition is secondary.<sup>6</sup> Concerning 'forsaken' R. HUMMEL considers two possibilities: 'As in vs.37 Jerusalem is addressed, in vs.38 either Jerusalem or the Temple is meant. Hence there are two possibilities for the understanding of ἀφ' ἑταυ : God forsakes Jerusalem and the Temple, i.e. withdraws his divine protection, or: God forsakes the Temple, i.e. the Shekina

1 R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p.20, perhaps is right in saying that the author of vs.31 ('believe') 'takes the Christian point of view', and thus the formulation is secondary.

2 See the beginning of the section, above p.240.

3 See however R. BULTMANN, *ibid.*, p.114.

4 Cf. Mt xi.20-24 par., and above pp.217f.

5 Cf. above p.241; (cit. Is lxii.10-12, last line).

6 Cf. R. BULTMANN, *ibid.*, p.115.

abandons the Holy of Holies. Both interpretations are possible.<sup>1</sup> As the Shekina was supposed to be wanting in the time of Jesus,<sup>2</sup> however, the following version of the second interpretation perhaps is more probable: The Temple is 'forsaken (and desolate)' because Jerusalem produced no adequate response to the appeal of Jesus and thus frustrated the return of God to Zion.

However, Matthew's formulation of xxiv.1 seems to point in the same direction as the second possibility mentioned by HUMMEL: 'Jesus left the temple and was going away ...' This is to say, when the Anointed finally leaves the Temple, this signifies that it is forsaken also by God. Consequently it has become useless and its destruction is only a question of time. 'Truly, I say to you, there will not be left here one stone upon another, that will not be thrown down' (Mt xxiv.2). In spite of the fact that the opening words of this prophecy are formulated differently by the three synoptics (cf. Mt xiv.1 parr.), we believe that the saying quoted here, which is striking because of the absence of details (cf. Lk xix.43,44), is the oldest form of the prediction of the destruction of the Temple and most probably goes back to Jesus himself.<sup>3</sup> We note that the Lament over Jerusalem (if 'your house' refers to the Temple) and the Prediction mark a complete change in Jesus' attitude to the Temple: after his attempt to restore the Sanctuary on Mount Zion, he now holds the view that it is doomed to disappear. From this time onwards, Jesus again concentrated on teaching his disciples, and that while sitting 'on the Mount of Olives opposite the temple' (Mk xiii.3).

There is yet another saying which refers to the Temple, namely Mk xiv.58 (cf. Mk xv.29; Mt xxvi.61, xxvii.40), and it reflects the changed attitude of Jesus mentioned above. According to Mark it contained false evidence, but the fact that the same accusation was taken up again against Stephen (Acts vi.14) makes this doubtful. The redaction of Matthew obviously attached much importance to this saying, for it is introduced as a legal evidence: "At last two came forward ..." (cf. Dt xvii.6). John inserts a similar saying into the context of the cleansing of the Temple (cf. Jn ii.19). Thus the authenticity of this saying, as J. JEREMIAS rightly points out, is ensured not only by its sixfold transmission but above all by

---

1 R. HUMMEL, *op. cit.*, p.88.

2 See above p.63.

3 See however R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p.36.

its significance as evidence in the Trial of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Whatever its original form, it confirms our earlier observation that the conception of the building of the Temple was related to Jesus, and that not by the early Church but most probably already in his own view.<sup>2</sup>

O. MICHEL explains the difference between the three versions of Mk xiv.58 par. as follows: 'Mk distinguishes between the Temple made with hands and the new miraculous building of the eschatological community, which is not made with hands, whilst Mt Jn draw attention to the power (Mt: δύναμις) and person (Jn: ραός τοῦ σώματος) of Jesus.' MICHEL proceeds, 'We have here an enigmatic saying of the oldest tradition, the exact form and original meaning of which is not quite certain.'<sup>3</sup>

If our previous interpretation of Jesus' attitude to the Temple is correct, it is probable that Mark's version is nearest to the authentic saying, for it differentiates between the Temple on Mount Zi on that is doomed to disappear, and the eschatological community. This implies, of course, that it is spoken by Jesus after his attempt to restore the former had failed and he finally had left the Temple. As to the adjectives χειροποίητον and ἀχειροποίητον, BULTMANN may be right in saying that Mark is secondary in this respect;<sup>4</sup> perhaps it is Mark's addition in order to point to the right interpretation. Although the words 'in three days' are present in all three versions of Mk xiv.58 par. as well as in Mk xv.29 par., it is doubtful whether they belong to the authentic saying, for they point to the risen body of Christ and not to the eschatological community.<sup>5</sup> We propose the following tentative reconstruction:

I will destroy this Temple ( ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον ),  
and build another one ( καὶ ἄλλον οἰκοδομήσω ).

The point, in this case, is: From now onwards Jesus' own 'house' will no more be linked up with 'their house', namely with the Temple of the people of Israel who rejected him.

1 Cf. J. JEREMIAS, *Weltvollender*, p.39; and also N. PERRIN, *op.cit.*, p.83.

2 Cf. O. MICHEL, art. ραός, in: *TWNT IV*, p.888: '... it is possible that the early community could not appropriate this saying and therefore declared it to be false evidence.'

3 *ibid.*, p.999.

4 Cf. R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p.120.

5 The passages Col ii.9; Eph. ii.20-22; 1 Pet ii.4-8 show that in the early Church the two conceptions merged.



According to R. HUMMEL, the decisive point of Matthew's reformulation of the saying is this: 'For Matthew the statement of Jesus, "I am able to destroy the temple of God ..." is a Messianic self-designation and is understood by the Sanhedrin as such (xxvi. 62-64).'<sup>1</sup> This is indeed very probable. In an 'Exkurs', however, HUMMEL proposes an entirely different line of interpretation for the second part of the saying: 'Matthew reckons with the possibility of an eschatological restoration of the Temple by Jesus.' 'Obviously', he proceeds later, 'Matthew wanted to include this feature of the Jewish hope, which especially after 70 was of the greatest importance, in the Christian message. The thought to see in Jesus the eschatological restorer and perfecter of the Temple was already given together with the confession of his Messiahship. For Judaism could ascribe this work to the Messiah.'<sup>2</sup>

Over against this, our present investigation into the theme of Jesus and the Temple made it probable that the historical Jesus conceived of his mission as the building of the eschatological Temple, first in the sense of a restoration of the one on Mount Zion by reforming the cult community, and then in the sense of an entirely new building which is to replace the doomed sanctuary, namely the 'Spiritual Temple', i.e. the eschatological community. On the other hand, we found that the final redaction of Matthew is not interested in the theme of the Temple, a fact which is expressed clearly in the Christological statement, 'I tell you, something greater than the temple is here. And if you had known what this means, "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice," (Hos vi. 6)...' (Mt xii. 6, 7).'<sup>3</sup>

It is very difficult to discern what Jesus actually taught during the last stage of his ministry at Jerusalem, after his withdrawal together with the disciples. BULTMANN may be right that the so-called Synoptic Apocalypse (Mk xiii. 3-27 parr.) in fact 'is a Jewish Apocalypse with a Christian editing.'<sup>4</sup> Following the line of our previous interpretation, we may expect that Jesus retained the hope for the consummation of the kingdom inaugurated on the Mount of the Sermon. The Parable of the Fig Tree seems to point in this direction, for Luke says, 'you know that the kingdom of God is near' (Lk xxi. 31b), parallel to Mark's and Matthew's 'you know that he (sc. the Son of Man) is near, at the very gates' (cf. Mk xiii. 29b par.). According to Mk xiii. 30-32 parr, the consummation of the kingdom will happen

---

1 R. HUMMEL, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

2 *ibid.*, p. 106.

3 See above p. 217.

4 R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p. 125.

within a generation, but no one, not even 'the Son, but only the Father' (omitted by Lk) will know the time.

How did Jesus conceive of the consummation of the kingdom, and thus of the fulfilment of his mission? Mt xxv.31ff. perhaps conveys his own view:<sup>1</sup>

When the Son of Man comes in his glory,  
and all the angels with him,  
then he will sit on his glorious throne.  
Before him will be gathered all the nations,  
and he will separate them one from another  
as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats,  
and he will place the sheep at his right hand,  
but the goats at the left.  
Then the King will say to those at his right hand,  
"Come, O blessed of my Father,  
inherit the kingdom prepared for you  
from the foundation of the world; ..." (31-34; cf. Mt viii.11,12)

If we may understand this view against its Old Testament background, the consummation of the kingdom can be defined in two expressions, namely: 'theophany' and 'eschatological pilgrimage'.

'In all passages without exception', J.JEREMIAS explains, 'where in the Old Testament the conception of the eschatological pilgrimage occurs, the destination of the pilgrimage is the place of God's revelation, the holy mountain of God, Zion. This is to say: The conception is always "centripetal"; the Gentiles are not evangelized (missioniert) at their dwelling-place but are called through the epiphany of God to the holy mountain. Zion stays in the centre. Salvation is the salvation of Israel, which is revealed before the astonished nations. Where the Old Testament includes them in the salvation it happens in this way that they are given part in the revelation granted to Israel and may participate in the holy community of God.'<sup>2</sup>

In this connection we may quote again R. MARTIN-ACHARD, who says referring to Is ii.2-4:<sup>3</sup>  
'We must stress this point: the gathering of the nations together at Jerusalem is due to God alone. The

---

<sup>1</sup> See however R.BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p.125; ('Jewish origin').

<sup>2</sup> J.JEREMIAS, *Verheissung*, p.51/52.

<sup>3</sup> See above p.66.

ascent of the heathen to the City of God is the consequence of the exaltation of Zion and the influence exerted on mankind by Jerusalem is the result of what Yahweh has wrought for His City. ... Empty-handed the heathen make their way into Zion, going up to Jerusalem to hear Yahweh's oracle and not to offer sacrifice there. For what they desire is to know the Word of God and to live by its teaching. At each festival, the Levites instruct the faithful as to the will of the God of Israel; according to Is. ii. 2-4, the nations, in their turn, will ask to be told about Yahweh's commands.<sup>1</sup>

How could the kingdom be consummated and the nations gathered unto the Lord when the very City of God rejected the Anointed and thus frustrated the Coming of the heavenly King? Jesus' answer to this question perhaps is contained in the Eucharistic Words (Mt xxvi. 26-29 // Mk xiv. 22-25 // Lk xxii. 15-20; cf. 1 Cor xi. 23-25).<sup>2</sup> 'And he said to them, "I have earnestly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer; for I tell you I shall not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God." And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, "Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I tell you that from now on I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." (Lk xxii. 15-17) - The answer is: Jesus goes the way of the Suffering Servant alone to the end; he himself will be the perfect sacrifice, whose blood will ratify the New Covenant (cf. Ex xxiv. 8; Jer xxxi. 31; Zech. ix. 11). By his twofold renunciation of the passover and the cup Jesus solemnly promises the consummation of the kingdom of God, i.e. his final coming as the universal King.<sup>3</sup>

On the following day, Jesus was crucified as King-Messiah.<sup>4</sup> After his death, 'the curtain of the temple was torn in two, from top to bottom' (Mk xv. 38 parr.). 'The rending of the veil', CONGAR says, 'signifies in the first place the end of the former system of worship. It is, in a sense, the first breach in the Temple whose destruction Jesus has foretold. It is a sign that the Temple is to lose its sacred character, is, we might almost say, to be profaned.'<sup>5</sup>

1 R. MARTIN-ACHARD, op.cit., p.69.

2 Cf. J. JEREMIAS, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, (3rd, completely revised ed.) Göttingen 1960; (cf. ET: *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*).

3 Cf. *ibid.*, V.2.

4 Cf. J. KLAUSNER, *Jesus*, p.353: 'The words "King of the Jews" are common to all the Gospels. The inference is clear that Jesus was crucified as "King-Messiah", which, for non-Jews, could only mean "King of the Jews".'

5 Y.M. -J. CONGAR, op.cit., p.142/43.



Seven weeks after Passover, 'when the day of Pentecost had come' the final theophany occurred on Mount Zion. However, not in the Temple but in an ordinary house, in the midst of the disciples of Jesus (Acts ii; cf. i.15: 'the company of persons was in all about a hundred and twenty'). In accordance with our previous line of interpretation, we assume that we have to do here with a legitimating theophany through which God marked his choice of the New Temple. Henceforth - as a matter of principle - the community of the crucified and risen Messiah was free from the Temple on Mount Zion, because God was in her midst. It is probable that this position, namely, freedom from the (Old) Temple, was already held by Jesus himself towards the end of the final period of his ministry. Nevertheless, it seems that the (Old) Temple for some time became the most important centre of teaching for the Apostles.<sup>1</sup> Later, however, we find Stephen arguing against the Temple (cf. Acts vi.13; vii.47-50).

Thus our discussion of the ministry of Jesus from the point of view of the theme 'Jesus and the Temple' reveals an inner coherency which links up seemingly unrelated passages to a consistent pattern. Although further investigation is needed because many questions remained unanswered and many passages - above all the parables - were not taken into account, it now has become probable that this pattern is no other than the 'Way of the Lord', Who marked His return to His Temple by two, or perhaps even three successive theophanies;

- (1) On the Mount of the Sermon, Jesus laid the foundation of the Spiritual Temple, i.e., the eschatological community, the 'firstlings' of the new mankind. The centre of the Sermon - as will be shown in the following chapter - is Mt v.14: the 'light' refers to the revelation of God's glory, i.e. to the first theophany which marks the beginning of the Way.
- (2) On the Mount of Transfiguration, the nucleus of the New Temple was dedicated by a theophany. At the same time, this theophany was a divine confirmation of the Messiahship of Jesus.
- (3) After the cleansing of the Temple on Mount Zion - which probably happened at the Feast of Tabernacles - Jesus expected a final theophany, namely the epiphany of God as King over all the earth.

---

<sup>1</sup> See B. GERHARDSSON, *op. cit.*, pp. 219ff.

However, another theophany actually occurred on the day of Pentecost, in the midst of the disciples of Jesus - after the crucifixion of the King-Messiah at the Feast of Passover. It probably signifies God's choice of the New Temple, over against the doomed sanctuary of Jerusalem, the New Palace where God henceforth exercises his kingly rule.

Admittedly, Luke's interpretation of Acts ii is different from the one suggested above. We must recall also T.W. MANSON's objection against the identification of the coming of the kingdom with the outpouring of the Spirit mentioned above.<sup>1</sup> As to the first point we note that Luke presents the event of Pentecost in accordance with his specific type of eschatology: Christ is the centre of time and the 'end' therefore is still in the future (cf. Acts ii.20b, 'before the day of the Lord comes, the great and manifest day'). What is still missing, then, is the aspect of universal manifestation or, in other words, the nations.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, MANSON is right in that Pentecost is not the final consummation of the kingdom; not yet the fulfilment of the expectation of Jesus, for no 'eschatological pilgrimage' is mentioned.

Is this the reason why Matthew omitted a reference to Pentecost and - we may conjecture - consciously replaced the theophany by a Christophany, namely the Missionary Charge of the Risen Lord, Mt xxviii.16-20? We note that vs.16 and 20a seem to point not only to xxviii.7 (where the mountain is missing) but also to the Mount of the Sermon, i.e. the mountain in Galilee where Jesus previously had 'commanded' the disciples. This implies that Matthew's Church regards herself to be at the stage of the 'few' according to the ideal development conceived by Jesus.<sup>3</sup> In order to gather the nations unto the Lord, the members of the Church are charged, in a similar way as the disciples in Mt x were sent to Israel: 'Go therefore and make disciples of all nations ...' (vs.19a). The initiation into the eschatological community has two aspects, namely 'baptizing' and 'teaching'. Finally, vs.20b suggests that the Church conceives of her mission as a participation in the mission of Jesus which - we may conjecture - is supposed to lead to the final consummation of the Kingdom envisaged by Jesus already on the Mount of the Sermon.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Cf. above p.233.

2 Or, does Luke in Acts ii.5ff. suggest that the nations were represented already?

3 See above p.229.

4 We shall take up the question of the connection between the Missionary Charge and the Sermon again in our Conclusions, chapter X.

After our previous discussion we are not surprised at the least in finding that the early Church knows the conception of the New or Spiritual Temple. Paul explicitly makes use of it in the following passages: 'For we are God's fellow workers; you are God's field, God's building. According to the commission of God given to me, like a skilled master builder I laid a foundation, and another man is building upon it. Let each man care how he builds upon it. For no other foundation can any one lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. ... Do you not know that you are God's temple (  $\nu\alpha\delta\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  ) and that God's Spirit dwells in you? If any one destroys God's temple, God will destroy him.<sup>1</sup> For God's temple is holy, and that temple you are' (1 Cor iii. 9-11, 16-17). - 'Do you not know that your body is a temple (  $\nu\alpha\delta\varsigma$  ) of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God? You are not your own; you were bought with a price. So glorify God in your body' (1 Cor vi. 19-20).<sup>2</sup> 'What agreement has the temple of God (  $\nu\alpha\delta\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  ) with idols? For we are the temple of the living God; as God said,

"I will live in them and move among them,  
and I will be their God,  
and they will be my people.  
therefore come out from them,  
and be separate from them, says the Lord,  
and touch nothing unclean;  
then I will welcome you,  
and I will be a father to you,  
and you shall be my sons and daughters, says the Lord Almighty."

Since we have these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from every defilement of body and spirit, and make holiness perfect (  $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \xi\gamma\kappa\omega\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta\nu$  ) in the fear of God' (2 Cor vi. 16-vii. 1).<sup>3</sup>

'It is obvious to suppose', O. MICHEL says, referring to these passages, 'that the apostle makes use of the prophecy of Jesus which in form is related to Mk xiv. 58 for his catechetical teaching.'<sup>4</sup>

1 Is this statement the reason why Mark declared Jesus' saying Mk div. 58 parr. to be 'false witness' (vs. 57)?

2 The individualistic tendency evident in this passage is not quite in line with Jesus' teaching.

3 On vii. 1 cf. OAB, ad loc: 'Make holiness perfect, be completely dedicated to God.'

4 O. MICHEL, art.  $\nu\alpha\delta\varsigma$ , in: TWNT IV, p. 890.



In the later apostolic tradition the conception of the Spiritual Temple still was relevant. Eph. ii.17-22 shows that at this time both former Jews and former Gentiles were full members of the Church and, moreover, that this was thought to reflect Jesus' own intention: 'And he came and preached peace to you who were far off and peace to those who were near; for through him we both have access in the Spirit to the Father. So then you are no longer strangers and sojourners, but you are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone, in whom the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple ( *ναὸν ἁγίον* ) in the Lord; in whom you also are built into it for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit.'

We may regard the four passages quoted above as external evidence which supports the interpretation of the scenes and sayings related to the theme 'Jesus and the Temple' advanced in this chapter. As further investigation is needed, however, we must formulate our conclusions cautiously: it has become probable that the outlook of the historical Jesus to a great extent is hierocentric, and that the pattern of the decisive phase of his ministry, i.e. from Galilee to Jerusalem, is the 'Way of the Lord' Who is about to return to Mount Zion together with his people. This implies that for Jesus the central point of his expectation is not the 'end',<sup>1</sup> but the coming of God himself. Consequently the truth of his Gospel depends on the question as to whether or not God has come.<sup>2</sup> The title of the following Chapter is meant to point to this question.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Cf. R. BULTMANN, *Christianity*, p. 92: 'Of course, Jesus was mistaken in thinking that the world was destined soon to come to an end. His error was similar to that of the ancient prophets who believed that God's redemptive act was immediately impending, or like Deutero-Isaiah, who thought it was already dawning in the present. Does his message therefore stand or fall with that misconception?'

2 See above pp. 58f.

3 Cf. above pp. 157f.

## VII

### THE REALISATION OF PERFECTION

#### 1 The cultic function of the Beatitudes

The findings of the previous chapter - although they lack final proof - encourage us to proceed now to the cultic interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount, in accordance with our hypothesis that the character of the authentic Sermon is cultic.<sup>1</sup> At the end of our discussion of the 'presupposition' of the Sermon and of 'perfection' in the Old Testament we have suggested that the basic structure of the Sermon - reflecting the structure of the temple cult - is twofold, and that accordingly in the Beatitudes we have to do with 'initiation into the presence and communion with God'.<sup>2</sup> Is this actually the function of the Beatitudes in the view of Jesus? We try to answer this question in the present section.

As far as we can see, a cultic approach to the Sermon on the Mount has not yet been attempted.<sup>3</sup> Thus we do not wish to make our own choice among the twelve approaches discussed by HARVEY K. McARTHUR, or combine several of them, but try to add a lucky thirteenth.<sup>4</sup> McARTHUR argues, 'A single category of interpretation must not be imposed, like a strait jacket, on all the statements of a single sermon.'<sup>5</sup> The background to this statement is the 'composite character of the Sermon on the Mount'. If our hypothesis is correct, however, a thorough-going cultic interpretation may be applied to the authentic Sermon and its basic structure. Moreover, if the outlook of Jesus to a great extent actually is hiero-centric,

---

1 See above p. 67.

2 Above p. 175.

3 See, e.g. H. K. McARTHUR, Understanding (cf. above p. 47), pp.106ff: II. Twelve Approaches to the Sermon on the Mount.

4 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 128.

5 *ibid.*, P. 129.

a cultic understanding of sayings added to the basic structure - we think here especially of the loose collection of sayings in Mt vi-vii - cannot be excluded a priori. Only those additions which obviously are redactional must not, of course, be understood cultically but rather from the point of view of the final redaction, which to a great extent is torah-centric. Besides, McARTHUR himself shows a tendency to impose a single category on the Sermon, namely, 'Ethics'.<sup>1</sup>

The title of the present chapter suggests that the cultic interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount will be advanced from the point of view of our main subject, i.e. 'perfection'. Admittedly, for the cultic interpretation of the whole Sermon this approach may entail some disadvantages. But the intimate relationship between the Sermon and the concept of perfection - which we are going to show presently - justifies it. Our approach implies that not only the Sermon but 'perfection' in its context as well will be interpreted cultically.

As we have seen above, the cultic origin of tamim has been recognised long ago by W. EICHRODT.<sup>2</sup> Neither T. OSNES<sup>3</sup> nor P. J. DU PLESSIS,<sup>4</sup> however, seem to consider this to be a constitutive element of the concept of perfection in the New Testament. The former attempts 'a more detailed definition of the specific character of the NT conception of perfection in relation to the most important conceptions, which are found in the world around it,'<sup>5</sup> namely: (1) the Platonic-Philonic, the Stoic-Philonic and the Aristotelian,<sup>6</sup> (2) the concept of perfection within Judaism,<sup>7</sup> (3) in Gnosticism,<sup>8</sup> and (4) in the Old Testament.<sup>9</sup> In the latter section, OSNES says, 'Both in the OT and in the NT the idea of a c o v e n a n t

---

1 Cf. Understanding, pp. 105/128: the title 'The Sermon and Ethics' seems to imply that the Sermon contains nothing but 'ethics'. In fact, this view is held very widely, more recently also by A. M. HUNTER, Design for Life, An Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, its Making, its Exegesis and its Meaning, London 1953. However, HUNTER prefers the synonymous term 'morality': 'Three things in the Sermon seem to us to set it in a place by itself in the long history of man's thinking about the good life: its insight into essential morality, its inwardness, and its universality. ... All the accidentals and irrelevancies - the mass of ceremonial details in the Law - he ignores, throwing all stress on the moral elements.' (p.24) - We shall see that this view needs qualification.

2 See above p. 130.

3 Cf. T. OSNES, Teleios (op. cit. above p.8).

4 Cf. P. J. DU PLESSIS, Teleios (op. cit. above p.8).

5 T. OSNES, *ibid.*, p. 365.

6 *ibid.*, pp. 365f.

7 *ibid.*, pp. 366f.

8 *ibid.*, pp. 368f.

9 *ibid.*, pp. 369f.



is the background - a covenant which God himself has instituted in his mercy.<sup>1</sup> This is correct. However, the author pays no attention to the 'place in life' of the concept of the covenant from the time of the First Temple till the destruction of the Third Temple in the year A.D. 70, namely the temple cult.

P. J. DU PLESSIS describes the purpose of his dissertation as follows: 'By its contents and method, therefore, this study aspires to be a contribution to the religious historical background and terminology of the New Testament.'<sup>2</sup> He begins with 'the history of the interpretation of *teleios*, and its derivatives, in the NT passages' and mentions six different possibilities, namely: (1) Moral Connotation,<sup>3</sup> (2) The Eschatological Interpretation,<sup>4</sup> (3) The Formal Interpretation,<sup>5</sup> (4) The Mystic Interpretation,<sup>6</sup> (5) *teleios* as a Gnostic Appellation,<sup>7</sup> and finally his own choice, (6) The LXX as Criterion.<sup>8</sup> In fact, DU PLESSIS starts from a (Greek) 'etymologically directed departing point'<sup>9</sup> rather than from the 'religious historical background' of the New Testament concept of perfection.

We now come to the important point of T. OSNES' and J. P. DU PLESSIS' approach to 'Christian Perfection in the context of the Sermon on the Mount'. Our poor understanding of Norwegian unfortunately

---

1 T. OSNES, *Teleios*, p. 369.

2 P. J. DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, p. 11.

3 *ibid.*, pp. 11ff.

4 *ibid.*, pp. 14f.

5 *ibid.*, pp. 15f.

6 *ibid.*, pp. 16ff.

7 *ibid.*, pp. 20ff.

8 *ibid.*, pp. 33ff; because of this choice, DU PLESSIS cannot do justice to the Old Testament concept of perfection (*tamim* etc.) as a possible background to the NT concept.

9 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 240: 'We started out from the supposition that to understand what *teleios* means, it is necessary to involve the usage of *telos* in the discussion. This etymologically directed departing point proved throughout the semasiological development of the theme a subsistent one (see pp. 36, 45).'

prevents us from representing the interpretation of Mt v.48 adopted by the former properly.<sup>1</sup> As far as we can see, OSNES finds the idea of imitation in this saying: the disciples behave in such a way that they are called perfect. It is not the difference between evil and good that is important, but the idea 'all-including'. God's perfection is his goodness without any limit. Hence according to v.48b the heavenly Father is an example. Verse 45 is a parallel to vs.48. What is the Father like? His goodness and his love are all-including, i.e. they include the evil and the good, the just and the unjust. God is perfect in his love and goodness. It is not God as we see him in the work of salvation who is the example for the disciples, but God in nature. - Of course, this brief summary does not do justice to OSNES' discussion. Finally, we may quote from the English summary of the whole study the following sentence, which seems to refer to Matthew: 'According to the synoptists the aim of those who belong to the new Israel, is to keep perfectly the commandments of the Messiah.'<sup>2</sup>

P. J. DU PLESSIS' approach to Mt v.48 is evident from the following passages: 'It is a passage singularly susceptible to misinterpretation if isolated from its environment and treated as an independent moral or religious logion. We must consider it from the point of view urged by the Sermon on the Mount of which it forms a part.'<sup>3</sup> The author says about the context, 'In an unobtrusive but clear way οὖν refers us to the immediately preceding vv. 43-47 for the key to unlock Christ's injunction ἐσθε ἑμεῖς τέλειοι. It recapitulates what these verses strive to teach and restates the message as a positive command. ... the sentence forms part of the impressive series of commands following upon the Beatitudes in the Sermon on the Mount. Beginning at 5.13 we are confronted with a continual commendation of good works, righteousness, necessity for fulfilling the Law and the Prophets, etc. The manner of their proposal reveals that they are put forward as conditions for admission to the Kingdom of God, which is the focus of this religious teaching.'<sup>4</sup>

1 See to the following T. OSNES, Teleios, pp. 115ff.: The concept of teleios in Matthew, where Mt v.48 and xix.21 are discussed.

2 *ibid.*, p. 355.

3 P. J. DU PLESSIS, Teleios, p. 168.

4 *ibid.*, p. 168; although no foot-note is attached to this last sentence, DU PLESSIS obviously adopts here the hypothesis by H. WINDISCH, Meaning, p. 27; (see above p. 216, n.2).

DU PLESSIS' approach to Mt v.48 to a certain extent points in the right direction, namely, in that it tries to understand 'perfection' from the point of view of the whole Sermon. However, he fails to investigate the religious-historical background of the 'conditions for admission' in the Old Testament, and thus to correct WINDISCH's thesis. In his 'Ethel M. Wood Lecture delivered before the University of London on 7 March 1961,' J. JEREMIAS - although he agrees that 'there is a real element of validity in it' - rejects WINDISCH's conception as 'perfectionist legalism'.<sup>1</sup> His own view is this: 'Something preceded. Every word of the Sermon was preceded by something else. It was preceded by the preaching of the Kingdom of God. It was preceded by the granting of sonship to the disciples (Matt. 5.16; 5.45; 5.48, etc.) ... The Gospel preceded the demand. Better: the sayings of Jesus which have been collected together in the Sermon on the Mount are part of the Gospel.'<sup>2</sup> The right understanding of the Sermon, in our opinion, lies between the conceptions of WINDISCH and JEREMIAS: The Sermon is gospel,<sup>3</sup> and that 'learnt gospel',<sup>4</sup> but this does not exclude 'conditions'.<sup>5</sup> The composition of the Sermon reveals the place of the latter.

In this connection we may quote the following observation by JOSEF B. SOUČEK: '1. The first is about the composition of the Sermon on the Mount. In this respect our double-word (sc. Mt v.13-16) holds a middle and key-position in chapter v, maybe even in the midst of the whole. This is to say, it represents a transition, so to speak a bridge between the promises of the Beatitudes and the obligations of the Antitheses and further counsels of the great discourse. We noted earlier a parallel transition from indicative to imperative in the previous tradition of the saying about the light. Thus the combination of indicative and imperative explicit in Paul is pre-formed already in the synoptic tradition.'<sup>6</sup> The parallel transition mentioned in this passage is this: 'The imperative of the instruction is anchored in the indicative of the election.'<sup>7</sup> Are the Beatitudes really 'promises'?

---

1 Cf. J. JEREMIAS, The Sermon on the Mount, London 1961, pp. 7-11.

2 *ibid.*, p. 29.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 32.

4 See above pp. 28-30; 67.

5 Cf. J. JEREMIAS, *ibid.*, p. 32: 'You must do all this, in order that you may be blessed' (perfectionist conception), which is excluded by JEREMIAS.

6 J. B. SOUČEK, Salz der Erde und Licht der Welt, Zur Exegese von Matt. 5, 13-16, in TZ, Jahrg. 19, Heft 3, Mai-Juni 1963, p. 177/78.

7 *ibid.*, p. 174.



At this point, the cultic interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount leads further. For the application of this method two things are essential. First, we must recall that - according to the definition by S. MOWINCKEL<sup>1</sup> - the focus of the cult is not 'ethics', i.e.  $\hat{\eta}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ , encounter and communion between man and man, but in the first place encounter and communion between God and man. Second, we must keep in mind the findings of the preliminary investigation in connection with the cultic interpretation of the Sermon, namely into the cultic origin of some concepts relevant for the Sermon and their 'place in life' in the temple-cult.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, we can begin now to classify the material of the Sermon in order to recognise the cultic 'acts' to which the 'words' are related. Or, in other words, to recognise the specific functions of the material of the Sermon on the Mount.

The first part of the Sermon is generally called 'The Beatitudes', because nine times in a row a saying begins with the words, 'blessed are ...' ( $\mu\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\iota$ ..., Mt v.3-11). If we study the end of this part more closely, however, it is obvious that v.12 too belongs to the Beatitudes. For although the opening formula may be different, namely, 'Rejoice and be glad ...' ( $\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\epsilon$  ...) its meaning is synonymous to the expression  $\mu\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\iota$ . However, there is a clear difference between the Beatitudes 1-8 and the last two: whilst the former group uses the third person, the latter has the second. It is well-known that Luke uses the second person throughout his Beatitudes (vi.20-23). With R. BULTMANN we hold 'that the change from the third person in Matthew to the second in Luke is Luke's work. Clearly by this change Luke wanted to introduce a comparison with vv.22f., where the second person was in the traditional form.'<sup>3</sup>

We note, then, that the first part of the Sermon on the Mount, which falls in two groups as to its form (third - second person) lay already before Matthew and Luke. As Luke changed the person in two (or, three: vi.21b) instances, it is not unreasonable to think that he changed the number of the Beatitudes too.<sup>4</sup> If this is correct, we must conclude that not only the present form of the Beatitudes according to Matthew, but the earlier tradition contained ten Beatitudes. In other words: We have to do with a Decalogue.

1 S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 15; see above p. 70.

2 See above, chapters III-IV, pp. 68-175.

3 R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p. 109/10.

4 So also WILHELM MICHAELIS, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, 1. Teil, (Prophezei) Zürich 1948, p. 189; see however, R. BULTMANN, *ibid.*, p. 109: 'Their number in Luke is the more original.'

In chapter III.1 we have adopted MOWINCKEL's thesis of the twofold 'place in life' of the decalogical tradition.<sup>1</sup> According to this thesis, its first 'place in life' is the 'entrance-liturgy', of which the conditions of entry to the Temple are the middle part.<sup>2</sup> Usually, these conditions are advanced through a priest in the third person, e.g.:

He who has clean hands and a pure heart, ... (Ps xxiv.4a).

Or: He who walks perfectly,

and does what is right,

and speaks truth from his heart; ... (Ps xv.2).

As Ps xv contains ten 'conditions',<sup>3</sup> this Decalogue - to a certain extent - may be regarded as the pattern for the present and perhaps also for the original composition of the Beatitudes.<sup>4</sup>

On the other hand, the Beatitudes differ from Pss xv and xxiv in that they contain - next to the conditions of entry - 'a blessing'. This part of the sayings Mt v.3-11 reflects the final stage of the 'entrance-liturgies', namely the priestly formula of admittance, which is reported in Ps xviii.26a:

Blessed is he who enters in the name of the Lord!

As we have seen above, this part of the 'entrance-liturgy' is reflected also in the initiation rite at Qumran: 'And the Priest shall bless all the men of the lot of God who walk perfectly in all his ways, saying: "May He bless you with all good and preserve you from all evil! May he lighten your heart with life-giving wisdom and grant you eternal knowledge! May He raise His merciful face towards you for everlasting bliss!"'<sup>5</sup>

We now turn - provisionally - to the content of the Beatitudes and ask: To what is admittance given by the 'blessing'? It is well known that the two Beatitudes Mt v.3 and 10 contain the same expression, namely 'for theirs is the kingdom of heaven'. 'The expression "kingdom of heaven" (mlkwt shmym)', J. KLAUSNER says, 'is typically Hebrew, and this Hebrew character is apparent in its Greek form which employs

1 See above p. 82ff.

2 See above p. 81.

3 Cf. above p. 140.

4 The relationship between the Beatitudes and Pss xv and xxiv was already recognised by H. WINDISCH, Meaning, p. 87/88, n.31: 'The Beatitudes represent an "eschatological table of virtues" comparable to the "cultic table of virtues" in Ps.15 and 24.3-6. ...'

5 For a reconstruction of the whole liturgy see above p. 186f. (cf. 1 QS ii.2).



the plural ( βασιλεῖα τῶν οὐρανῶν ) to translate the Hebrew dual form shmym. The Jews of the time habitually used heaven to avoid having to pronounce the name of God; so "the kingdom of heaven" meant "the kingdom of God", or "the kingdom of the Almighty", i.e. the messianic age.<sup>1</sup>

What was the significance Jesus himself attached to the expression 'kingdom of heaven'? It is quite probable that this expression in Mt v. 3 and 10 corresponds to 'your Father who is in heaven' in v. 16c. Although both expressions are favourite words with the first evangelist, we hold - with G. STRECKER<sup>2</sup> - that they are not characteristic for the final redaction but already found in the old tradition. T. W. MANSON rightly draws attention to the close relationship between the expressions 'Kingdom of God' and 'Fatherhood of God'.<sup>3</sup> In Mt v. 16c the designation 'Father (who is in heaven)' occurs for the first time in the Gospel of Matthew. MANSON came - on the ground of all four sources, especially of Mk and Q - to the conclusion 'that Jesus rarely if ever spoke directly of God as Father except to his disciples and that he began to speak to them in this way only after Peter's Confession'.<sup>4</sup> The second part of this conclusion is possible only if the 'M-hypothesis' is adopted. If we hold that the so-called 'M-materials' to a great extent are part of the old 'Q-tradition', however, the picture becomes completely different: 'The first thing that strikes us in this table (sc. of the occurrences of "Father" in M) is that almost half of the cases in M are in the Sermon on the Mount'.<sup>5</sup> Hence we may conclude: Jesus began to speak to his disciples of God as 'your Father (who is in heaven)' only after the first part of the Sermon on the Mount.

Before we are able to recognise what this conclusion implies, we must ask, When Jesus says, "Blessed are such and such, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven", how near is the kingdom? WILHELM MICHAELIS points out, 'Where in the Greek a verb occurs (this is only the case in v. 11; Lk vi. 22), it is in

1 J. KLAUSNER, *Jesus*, p. 245.

2 Cf. G. STRECKER, op. cit., p. 17/18; over against STRECKER, with G. SCHRENK, *TWNT V*, p. 885 (cf. STRECKER, *ibid.*, p. 18, n. 2), we hold that Luke most probably eliminated the expression 'of (in) heaven' because of its Hebrew character, especially in Lk vi. 35.

3 Cf. T. W. MANSON, *Teaching*, p. 135.

4 *ibid.*, p. 98.

5 *ibid.*, p. 97; MANSON's observation, 'It is noteworthy that in M "my Father" belongs to the period after Peter's Confession' (*ibid.*, p. 97, n. 1) is interesting because it suggests the Messianic significance of this expression: Jesus is the Son, i.e. the Anointed.



the present tense. Hence *n o w* - not only some day - is valid: "Blessed are ...".<sup>1</sup> As to the second line of the Beatitudes, the generally accepted opinion is that we have to do here with a promise that points to the future: Blessed are such and such now, for when the kingdom of heaven will come it will be theirs. However, in Mt v.3 and 11 this so-called 'promise' is in the present tense:  $\alpha \beta \tau \omega \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ , theirs is.<sup>2</sup> This is not surprising when we recognise the cultic background of the Beatitudes, for 'contemporaneity' is a prominent feature of cultic or liturgical language. This term implies that 'in worship the redemptive event was made present' (Ex xii.26-27; see Dt v.2-3n).<sup>3</sup>

The following passage may serve as an illustration of the feature of 'contemporaneity': 'You stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; the heads of your tribes, your elders, and officers, all the men of Israel, your little ones, your wives, and the sojourner who is in your camp, both he who hews your wood and he who draws your water, that you may enter into the sworn covenant of the Lord your God, which the Lord your God makes with you this day; that he may establish you this day as his people, and that he may be your God, as he promised you, and as he swore to your fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. Nor is it with you only that I make this sworn covenant, but with him who is not here with us this day as well as with him who stands here with us this day before the Lord our God' (Dt xxix.10-15).<sup>4</sup>

The view of H. WINDISCH, that the Sermon on the Mount is a proclamation 'addressed to people at large',<sup>5</sup> led him to the following definition of the function of the Beatitudes: 'Even according to the Beatitudes, entrance to the Kingdom of Heaven is promised as a reward, or as a gift of the grace of God, for a definite kind of attitude and for a definite pattern of behaviour. The promises are words of comfort. They seek to *a t t r a c t* from among the variegated world of men those types and groups which, according to the prophetic insight of Jesus, are to receive eschatological salvation. The words "theirs" and "they" are

1 W. MICHAELIS, *Mt I*, p. 190.

2 We realise that in view of a possible Hebrew or Aramaic original this point may not be pressed.

3 *OAB*, ad Ex xiii.8.

4 On the cultic feature of 'contemporaneity' cf. G. VON RAD, *Studien AT*, p. 36/37.

5 H. WINDISCH, *Meaning*, p. 64.

emphasized; they and none others.<sup>1</sup> Our view is that the Sermon on the Mount, and thus the Beatitudes too, is addressed exclusively to the disciples,<sup>2</sup> and that the Beatitudes may be understood against the background of the 'entrance-liturgies'. Consequently they contain 'conditions of admittance',<sup>3</sup> and the priestly formula of admittance plus the twofold reference to the kingdom of heaven (cf. Mt v. 3, 10) suggest that they are not merely meant to attract for the future kingdom - as WINDISCH holds - but rather that the function of the Beatitudes is the initiation of the disciples into the kingdom of heaven, which herewith to a certain extent already becomes a present reality.<sup>4</sup>

We now are able to recognise the implication of the expression 'your Father who is in heaven' in Mt v. 16c:<sup>5</sup> Jesus began to speak to his disciples of God as 'your Father' only after their initiation into the kingdom of heaven. Hence from the point of view of Jesus' use of the term 'Father' in the Sermon on the Mount,<sup>6</sup> we may conclude that the rite of initiation reflected in the Beatitudes in the deepest sense is an adoption. This is confirmed by Mt v. 9, 'for they shall be called sons of God', and v. 45, 'so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven'.<sup>7</sup> It may be added that Jesus' teaching on this point seems

---

1 H. WINDISCH, Meaning, p. 26/27; (our spacing).

2 See above p. 41.

3 So also J. J. JEPSON, in: ST. AUGUSTINE, The Lord's Sermon (cf. above p. 47, n.1), p. 6: The Sermon on the Mount begins with the Beatitudes (Matthew 5.3-12) which constitute so many conditions for the entrance into God's kingdom...

4 H. WINDISCH, *ibid.*, p. 87/88, n. 31, is right in saying, 'Matthew's unarticulated question, "Who will enter the Kingdom of Heaven?" corresponds to the introductory question in the psalm, "Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord?"... His wholly futuristic understanding of the kingdom, however, prevents him from seeing that the entry (initiation) is possible already in the present.

5 Cf. above p. 264.

6 Cf. Mt v. 16, 'your Father in heaven'; 48, 'your heavenly Father'; vi. 4, 'your Father', 8, 'your Father', 9, 'Our Father who art in heaven', 14, 'your heavenly Father', 15, 'your Father', 18, 'your Father (bis)', 26, 'your heavenly Father', 32, 'your heavenly Father'; vii. 11, 'your Father who is in heaven'; (21 'my Father who is in heaven').

7 Thus J. JEREMIAS, Sermon, p. 29, is not quite right in saying that every word of the Sermon 'was preceded by the granting of sonship to the disciples (Matt. 5.16; 5.45; 5.48, etc.)'. (cf. above p. 261) - The sayings mentioned are preceded by the Beatitudes, i.e. an initiation rite which signifies the granting of sonship, which are part of the authentic Sermon.



to correspond to a certain extent to that of the Rabbis 'who hold that sonship is in some way conditioned by the character of the individual or the nation.'<sup>1</sup> The conditions advanced by Jesus, as we have seen, are contained in the Beatitudes.

At last we are able to understand, too, Jesus' interpretation of the central concept of the 'kingdom of heaven'. In his view, the disciples who 'enter' the kingdom (Temple), i. e. who accept the sovereignty of God, are not the 'subjects' of the heavenly King,<sup>2</sup> but rather his sons. This implies that for his disciples Jesus seems to have re-interpreted the concept of kingship of Yahweh (= kingdom of heaven)<sup>3</sup> in terms of divine Fatherhood.<sup>4</sup> If we follow this line of interpretation further we find that the Palace // Temple where the Father rules is his 'house' (cf. Mt vii.24-27).<sup>5</sup> The following scheme, in which the terms that are not found in the Sermon on the Mount are put into brackets, may thus clarify Jesus' terminology:

Father	-	(Fatherhood)	-	son	-	house
//		//		//		//
(King)	-	kingship(-dom)	-	(subject)	-	(Palace//Temple) <sup>6</sup>

When Jesus says, 'for theirs is the kingdom of heaven', then, we may paraphrase this expression by, 'for they are the object of God's paternal guidance'. This is the new way God asserts his royal power: He 'comes' like a Father to his sons and daughters. The re-interpretation of the kingship of God in terms of his

- 
- 1 T. W. MANSON, Teaching, p. 93; other Rabbis 'maintain that all Israelites are the sons of God - foolish sons, untrustworthy sons, vicious sons maybe, yet nevertheless sons' (ibid.).
  - 2 Cf. ibid., p. 135/36: 'When the sovereignty of God is thus accepted the Kingdom becomes a present reality to those who are the subjects of the King.'
  - 3 On the Old Testament concept see above, pp. 88ff.
  - 4 Cf. T. W. MANSON, ibid., p. 135; (Kingdom // Fatherhood). On the other hand, as 'sons' the disciples - like Jesus himself - are also 'servants', which, as MANSON, ibid., p. 137 points out, 'in Hebrew has as one of its normal meanings "subject" of a King.'
  - 5 Cf. above p. 230, and p. 227; thus 'house' has a threefold meaning, namely (1) dwelling-place of a family (2) of the King (Palace), (3) of God (Temple).
  - 6 Cf. W. A. CURTIS, Jesus Christ the Teacher, A Study of His Method and Message Based Mainly on the Earlier Gospels, Oxford 1943, p. 116: 'It is another illustration of the essential fidelity of the Fourth Gospel to the original teaching, that it speaks of God's fatherhood as constantly as it affirms the Messianic dignity of Jesus, and makes fatherhood and sonship the distinctive and ultimate notes of the Christian message instead of kingship and subjection.'



Fatherhood perhaps is why 'Jesus does not use the phrase that the kingdom is to be revealed, but in contrast to Judaism speaks of its' - or in this case better: His - 'coming.'<sup>1</sup> Accordingly we may interpret Jesus' expression 'to enter the kingdom of heaven' (cf., e.g., Mt vii.21) in the sense of entering into filial relationship with God.

In this connection we may consider briefly the Lord's Prayer (Mt vi. 9-13 // Lk xi. 2-4). H. K. McARTHUR remarks, 'An eschatological enthusiast could relate every petition in this prayer to the Eschaton, with the possible exception of "Give us this day our daily bread." The second petition, "Thy kingdom come", clearly requires such a reference.'<sup>2</sup> McARTHUR certainly is right about the future reference of the second petition. Nevertheless this cannot be used as an argument against our view that in the Sermon on the Mount we have to do with the inauguration of the kingdom, and that it is the function of the Beatitudes to initiate the disciples into it.

As we have seen above, the Lord's Prayer most probably is interpolated into the context of the Sermon by the final redaction of Matthew, for it breaks up the composition of Mt vi.2-18, which is a didactic poem in three stanzas (cf. 4b, 6b, 19b).<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless we may use this Prayer as evidence for Jesus' understanding of the kingdom in the Sermon, because it is teaching addressed to the disciples (cf. Lk xi.1). N. PERRIN is right in saying, 'the "abba" of the Lord's Prayer certainly has a present reference; an indication of the characteristic tension between present and future in the teaching of Jesus.'<sup>4</sup> Thus this unique address<sup>5</sup> implies the 'realisation of the Fatherhood of God',<sup>6</sup> and at the same time - at least for the disciples - the realisation of the kingdom of heaven. Hence it follows that the Lord's Prayer presupposes the adoption or

---

1 S. AALEN, 'Reign' and 'House', p. 223.

2 H. K. McARTHUR, Understanding, p. 88.

3 See above p. 45.

4 N. PERRIN, *op.cit.*, p. 192.

5 Cf. N. PERRIN, *ibid.*, p. 192, with ref. to J. JEREMIAS, ExpT 71, p. 144: 'is totally without parallel in first-century Judaism. The disciples are being taught to use the child's word of God, a practice specifically avoided by the Jews, and this can only be an indication of the new relationship with God which they enjoy as a result of their response to his kingly activity manifest in Jesus and his ministry.'

6 T. W. MANSON, Sayings, p. 168: the context reads: 'He (sc. Jesus) used "abba" of God and taught His followers to do the same. This is an indication of the depth and intensity of His realisation of the Fatherhood of God, a realisation in which He would have His disciples share.'

initiation which is reflected in the Beatitudes.

It is from this point of view we must regard the eschatological reference in the expression 'thy kingdom come'. To quote PERRIN again, '... we must remember that those who are being taught to use this petition are those for whom the Kingdom is already a matter of personal experience. They are, therefore, either being taught to pray that others may share this experience; or, more probably, they are being taught to pray for the consummation of that which has begun within their experience.'<sup>1</sup> In order to bring out the latter point more clearly, the layout or, at least, the punctuation marks should be as follows:

Thy kingdom come, thy will be done,  
on earth as it is in heaven.<sup>2</sup> (Mt vi.10; cf. Lk xi.2c)

We may assume that Luke, in accordance with his view of the kingdom, omitted the words, 'thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven', in order to emphasize the future reference. In doing so, he also eliminated the important ethical issue of the coming of the kingdom, namely obedience to the One Who is coming.

T. W. MANSON says, referring to the words omitted by Luke, 'The petition certainly has an eschatological sense: the time when the Kingdom has come will be a time when God's will will be supreme on earth as in heaven. But it need not be an exclusively eschatological petition. There is a sense in which the Kingdom comes whenever and wherever God's will is acknowledged and obeyed on earth. And the prayer, if it is to be sincerely prayed, must have a reference to him who prays it. Thy will be done - and done by me.'<sup>3</sup> The significance of Jesus' re-interpretation of the concept of the kingship of God lies as much in his emphasis of the ethical issue as in his preference of the divine epithet 'Father' to the epithet 'King'.

Jesus' re-interpretation of the concept of kingship does not exclude the idea of theophany: the coming of the kingdom of heaven is the epiphany of God himself, as the heavenly Father, whose power and glory is

---

1 N. PERRIN, op. cit. p. 193.

2 S. AALEN, 'Reign' and 'House', p. 222, explicitly denies that the two petitions belong together: 'There is no reason for so close a relationship between these two prayers in Our Father.' Cf. also the RSV:

Thy kingdom come.  
Thy will be done,  
On earth as it is in heaven.

3 T. W. MANSON, Sayings, p. 169; MANSON adds, 'Cf. Mk.14.36, which is the best commentary on the petition.'



manifested in the community around Jesus.<sup>1</sup> We have seen at the end of our previous chapter that successive theophanies mark the 'Way of the Lord',<sup>2</sup> and we shall point out in the third section of the present chapter the evidence for our assumption that the Sermon on the Mount presupposes a theophany. The question as to whether or not the character of the kingdom is 'visionary',<sup>3</sup> i.e. somewhere between visible (cf. Lk xviii.20,21) and unrecognisable, in our opinion is parallel to the question as to whether or not God himself can be 'seen' (cf. Mt v.8). In a cultic context the answer to both questions to a certain extent is in the affirmative.<sup>4</sup>

Jesus shared the expression 'Father' as a divine epithet with the Old Testament and with contemporary Judaism,<sup>5</sup> and it is probable that it was used also in the temple cult. 'In the oldest prayers in the Jewish liturgy', MANSON says, ' "Our Father" is found as a form of address to God; for example in the "Ahabah" prayer, which according to the late Dr. Abrahams probably belonged already to the service of the Temple (before A.D. 70), we have the petition, "Our Father, our King, ... be gracious unto us and teach us. Our Father, merciful Father, ever compassionate, have mercy upon us".'<sup>6</sup>

There is yet another aspect of the initiation into and the inauguration of the kingdom of heaven, which is evident from the following passage by A. RICHARDSON: 'The Gospels represent him (sc. Jesus) not merely as proclaiming the reign of God but as actually setting up the community of the reign of God, the fellowship of the Messianic rule. In this reign those who were called were to be not merely passive subjects,

---

1 See however S. AALEN, 'Reign' and 'House', p. 222: 'The βασιλεία of God as the epiphany of God himself, as king, in glory and power, was a thought he (sc. Jesus) was not able to adopt. He rejected the Jewish concept of a Messiah in glory and himself only wished to be a Messiah in humility and suffering - in any case for the present.' AALEN's alternative is this: 'As we shall soon see, it (sc. the kingdom) is to be understood as a community, a house, an area where the goods of salvation are available and received.' We already pointed out that the latter identification is not correct (cf. p. 214, n.1); only towards the end of his article AALEN formulates more carefully: 'the community around Jesus' is 'the manifestation of the kingdom' (ibid., p. 232).

2 See above p. 253/54.

3 Cf. S. AALEN, ibid., p. 226: 'The significance of this difference (sc. between the Jewish phraseology "revelation" of the kingdom and Jesus "coming") is that Jesus wants to maintain the historic, non-visionary character of the kingdom, while Judaism expects a theophanic appearance of it.'

4 See below p. 289 ff.

5 Cf. T. W. MANSON, Teaching, p. 93.

6 Cf. ibid., p. 92.



ruled over; they were to be co-rulers in the Messianic reign which God had appointed to Jesus himself: "I appoint unto you a βασιλεία even as my Father appointed unto me ... and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Luke 22.29f.; cf. Matt. 19.28). But the reign of the elect was to be of an utterly different character from that of the kings and so-called "benefactors" of the Gentiles, since in the divine realm royalty is measured in terms of service (Mark 10.42-45; Luke 22.24-28); ... The expression εἶσθε ὑποταγεῖς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ means much more than to become a subject of God's Kingdom; it means to receive a share in God's Kingship, to be one of those appointed to reign. Jesus himself speaks of "the poor in spirit", i.e. the Christian hasidhim, as those to whom the heavenly Kingship belongs; they are the meek who, according to the prophecy of Ps. 37.11, shall inherit the earth.<sup>1</sup>

This aspect must be understood not only against the two significant texts Ex xix.6 and Dan vii.22 - as RICHARDSON rightly says<sup>2</sup> - but above all against the Enthronement Festival and the cultic role of the earthly king as the representative of God.<sup>3</sup> Thus the aspect of kingship ties up with the concept of the sonship of the king, which - as we have seen above<sup>4</sup> - designates the king as the mediator through whom God blesses and rules his people.

It has been suggested above that the vital point of the new cult inaugurated by Jesus is the individual initiation into the Temple // kingdom(-ship) of God.<sup>5</sup> This point has been characteristic for Christianity ever since. And it is at this point that the concept of perfection comes in. This is one of the most important conclusions of T. OSNES' study: 'Furthermore, the NT appears to make it quite clear that, through Baptism, man is made a member of this new humanity. And, as a member, he is

1 A. RICHARDSON, *Theology*, p. 86/87.

2 *ibid.*, p. 86.

3 See above pp. 109; this is not realised by S. AALEN, when he says, 'For if the word βασιλεία in the phrase "kingdom of God" really means "reign", then it must be God who is the king, and not Christ, as far as this phrase is concerned. ... In fact, the more one stresses the idea that Christ is the king, the more it becomes a problem how God himself can be the king - which the term "kingdom of God" clearly demands if βασιλεία here means "reign".' ('Reign' and 'House', p. 217) - In the cult, the kingship of Yahweh and that of the earthly king do not exclude each other. The earthly king can exercise his kingship only after his enthronement, or his 'adoption' as God's 'son' (cf. Ps ii.7).

4 Cf. above p. 123.

5 See above p. 216.

sharing in all God's spiritual blessing which belongs to the new humanity through God's work in Christ.<sup>1</sup> ... As a preliminary result we want to stress that full initiation into and full knowledge of the reality into which man enters through Baptism, belongs to Christian perfection. Man cannot reach this himself, he has to submit himself to the revealing work of the Spirit, bound up with the preaching.<sup>2</sup> We are not concerned here with the question as to why the 'initiation rite' reflected in the Beatitudes was supplemented<sup>3</sup> or even replaced by the 'initiation rite' of Baptism by the early Church, but with the relationship between 'initiation' and 'perfection'.

AUGUSTINE, we believe, points in the right direction, when he says, 'The Beatitudes mark the stages traversed towards perfection.'<sup>4</sup> ... The eighth maxim returns, as it were, to the beginning, because it shows and commends what is perfect and complete. ... Seven in number, therefore, are the things which lead to perfection. The eighth maxim throws light upon perfection and shows what it consists of, so that, with this maxim beginning again, so to speak, from the first, the two together may serve as steps toward the perfection of the others also.<sup>5</sup>

When we recall the meaning of *tamim* in the context of initiation, namely 'entire consecration to the Deity',<sup>6</sup> we may say: the real object of Jesus' conditions contained in the Beatitudes is to teach the disciples how to consecrate themselves wholly to God, or how to enter into the presence and communion with God. The priestly formula of admittance, or initiation, 'Blessed is (are) ...' marks the moment when the final stage is reached, i.e. when perfection is realised. Hence we may speak of initiation as the realisation of perfection.

---

1 T. OSNES, *Teleios*, p. 354.

2 *ibid.*, p. 357.

3 See above p. 254; (Mt xxviii.19,20: 'make disciples' = baptizing + teaching).

4 AUGUSTINE, *The Lord's Sermon*, p. 16; (title of chapter 3).

5 *ibid.*, p. 18.

6 See above p. 160.

## 2 The cultic interpretation of the Beatitudes

The cultic interpretation of the Beatitudes recognises behind their present form the pattern of the 'entrance-liturgies', which seem to have contained the following four parts:<sup>1</sup>

- (1) The inquiry of the procession for the conditions of admission:

Who shall ascend the hill of the Lord?

And who shall stand in his holy place? (Ps xxiv.3; cf. Ps xv.1)

- (2) The instruction of the 'gate-keeper': 'he that hath kept such and such rules; he that is of such and such a character.' (Cf. Pss xxiv.4-6; xv.2-5b)

- (3) The answer of the procession: 'we have kept and fulfilled all this.' (Cf. Ps xv.5c)<sup>2</sup>

- (4) The blessing of the initiants by the 'gate-keeper', who may have used the priestly formula of admittance preserved in Ps cxviii.26a:<sup>3</sup>

Blessed be he who enters in the name of the Lord!

(LXX = εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου)

'Whatever the point of view adopted concerning the kingdom of God as Jesus proclaimed it:'

H. CLAVIER says, 'apocalyptic, eschatological, mystical, individual, social, one thing is certain: There are conditions of admission to the kingdom of God.'<sup>4</sup> What is more natural than to assume that the idea of the 'conditions' proclaimed by Jesus stems from the 'entrance-liturgies' to the Temple of Jerusalem, the focal point of Israel's life? Over against the scribes and Pharisees, who 'shut the kingdom of heaven against men', Jesus allows 'those who would enter to go in' (Mt xxiii.13) - on the conditions of admission as God has revealed through him. Of course, initiation into the kingdom of heaven does not primarily depend on human will but on divine election;

---

1 For the first three points see above p. 81; (S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalms I*, p. 178).

2 Cf. S. MOWINCKEL, *ibid.*, p. 179: 'Such an answer may be detailed: I have not committed this and this and this. In Ps.24 it is summed up shortly in v.6: "Such are the men who are in quest of Yahweh, who seek the face of the God of Jacob", i.e. we are confident of fulfilling the demands.'

3 Cf. above p. 138.

4 H. CLAVIER, *L'Accès au Royaume*, in: *RHPR* 1942, No. 1, p. 1.



Blessed is he whom thou dost choose and bring near,

(LXX = μακάριος ὃν ἐξελέξω καὶ προσελάβου.)

to dwell in thy courts!

We shall be satisfied with the goodness of thy house,

thy holy temple! (Ps 1xv.4)

We now come to the question, How is the four-fold pattern of the 'entrance-liturgies' reproduced in the Beatitudes? As WINDISCH has pointed out,<sup>1</sup> the first point, i.e. the inquiry of the procession, which would read: 'Who will enter the Kingdom of Heaven?', is unarticulated. The same is the case with the third point, i.e. the answer of the procession, 'We fulfil the conditions'. Of course, any reconstruction of the 'initiation rite' on the Mount of the Sermon is conjectural. It may have depended on Jesus' method of teaching, which is described by A. C. DEANE in the following passage: 'The method of the Jewish religious teachers was to compress into a few succinct and pointed sentences the expression of any truth they deemed of special importance. Then the teacher would repeat the sentences many times with his disciples, until they knew them by heart. There is every reason to suppose that Jesus used this accustomed method of teaching by repetition. The pointed gnomic sentences of which the Sermon on the Mount consists are exactly suited to this purpose.'<sup>2</sup>

The present form of the Beatitudes suggests that each one is a 'compressed version' of the 'entrance-liturgies'. We recognise the second and the fourth point of the liturgies, and in addition to these a 'promise' that describes the nature of the 'blessing' that follows on the entry:

Blessed are (4) the poor in spirit (2),

for theirs is the kingdom of heaven (promise).

Re-formulated as a 'condition', point 2 reads: 'He who is poor in spirit'.<sup>3</sup> The full meaning of point 4 plus promise is this: 'Blessed be he who enters on the name of the Lord, for his is the kingdom of heaven'. By using the plural, Jesus emphasises the blessedness of the eschatological community, although individual initiation is presupposed. Although each Beatitude is a 'compressed version' of the 'entrance-liturgies', admission is granted only after the fulfilment of the whole series of conditions, in accordance with the cultic pattern

1 See above p. 266, n.4.

2 A. C. DEANE, How to understand the Gospels, cit. from A. M. HUNTER, Design, p. 12.

3 See above p.140; (Ps xv).

(cf. Ps xv). For the sake of clarity we treat the Beatitudes separately, following the original sequence condition (2) - blessing (4) - (promise).

(1) The first Beatitude (Mt v.3//Lk vi.20). - According to Matthew's version of this saying, the first condition is: He who is 'poor in spirit'. Since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the discussion as to whether or not the two words 'in spirit' are an editorial interpolation has entered a new stage. 'The very first of the beatitudes (Mt v.3)', KURT SCHUBERT says 'indicates a conscious awareness of Essene thought and an intention of Jesus to make clear his stand against their sect.'<sup>1</sup> The point is that the expression  $\pi\tau\omega\chi\omicron\iota$  does not denote, as its single use in Lk vi. 20 might suggest, the destitute, nor the 'so-called am ha-ares, the vast group of little and despised people,' as goes the widespread opinion.<sup>2</sup> The correct denotation of the expression is rather illuminated by the passage 1 QM xiv.7, where we find the term  $\text{'anawe ruah}$ , of which Matthew's  $\omicron\iota\pi\tau\omega\chi\omicron\iota\tau\hat{\omega}\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  is an exact parallel.<sup>3</sup> The meaning of this term is evident from the religious life of the Sect, who uses it as a self-designation. Its members are the 'poor in will', the 'poor in inward agreement', or the 'voluntary poor'.<sup>4</sup>

Thus it is quite probable that Matthew's version, He who is 'poor in spirit', reflects the authentic condition advanced by Jesus on the Mount.<sup>5</sup> Are we to think, then, of 'paupertas voluntaria'? This interpretation seems to be confirmed by Mk x.28, where Peter says, in a context in which the expression 'to enter the kingdom of God' occurs three times (cf. x.23, 24, 25): 'Lo we have left everything and followed you.' DIETRICH BONHOEFFER in his time protested, 'Since the days of the Clementines, Catholic exegesis has applied this beatitude to the virtue of poverty, the paupertas voluntaria of the monks, or any kind of poverty undertaken voluntarily for the sake of Christ. But in both cases the error lies in looking for some kind of human

1 K. SCHUBERT, The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts, in: The Scrolls and the New Testament, (ed. K. STENDAHL), London 1958, p. 121/22.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 122.

3 So also MAYER-REUSS, Qumran-Funde, pp. 45, 132.

4 K. SCHUBERT, *ibid.*, p. 122; SCHUBERT's interpretation is criticised by W. D. DAVIES, Setting, p. 251, who holds that Mt v.3 indicates 'the recognition that the Kingdom was a miracle of grace: it was for "the poor".' Cf. the following n.

5 Cf. A. M. HUNTER, Design, p. 31: 'Since there is nothing ethical, let alone blessed in economic poverty as such, Matthew's addition "in spirit" points the way to the right interpretation.'

behaviour as the ground for the beatitude instead of the call and promise of Jesus alone.<sup>1</sup>

BONHOEFFER's alternative, i.e. either 'call and promise of Jesus' or 'some human behaviour', is not quite correct. We have to do here rather with a condition of admission and its fulfilment through the disciples: They are blessed because they are 'voluntarily poor' here and now. The vital point of this condition is evident from the saying Mt vi. 24:

No one can serve two masters;  
for either he will hate the one and love the other,  
or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other.  
You cannot serve God and Mammon.

This, then, is the cultic alternative: To serve either God or Mammon. Hence he who is 'voluntarily poor' is he who is free from Mammon, or, to put it positively: free for God.

The first condition of admission involves an effort of will. This is clear from Mt xix. 21, 22: 'Jesus said to him, "If you would be perfect, go, sell what you possess and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me." When the young man heard this he went away sorrowful; for he had great possessions.' In spite of Jesus' call and promise - the latter seems to be parallel to 'enter the kingdom of heaven' (cf. xix. 23, 24) - the young man did not have the will-power to fulfil His first condition: He who is 'poor in spirit', i.e. 'voluntarily poor'. Matthew describes the condition 'to sell what you possess' as a condition for 'perfection', which we may interpret - if 'perfect' is authentic in this context<sup>2</sup> - as a condition for those who want to be wholly consecrated to God. P. J. DU PLESSIS is right in saying, 'The immediately succeeding vv. 23-24 reveals that the issue is not the determination of higher and lower moral grades, or how to attain to a higher rank among His followers, but the question of gaining admission to the Kingdom of Heaven. This is a matter with which every one of His followers is concerned.'<sup>3</sup>

---

1 D. BONHOEFFER, ET: The Cost of Discipleship, (London 1959), p. 96, n. 2.

2 This is doubtful; see below, VIII, 3.

3 P. J. DU PLESSIS, Teleois, p. 172; on the so-called 'Double Standard View' see H. K. McARTHUR, Understanding, pp. 114ff., and 131ff.; McARTHUR's view is, 'Surely all Christians are "in the same boat" when they are confronted by the demands of the Sermon and surely all ought to live their lives with the awareness of the full obligation placed upon them.' (ibid., p. 133).



HERBERT BRAUN explains the difference between the Scrolls and the synoptics concerning the point in question as follows: 'But however this may be as to the extent of the requirement in the oldest synoptic layer, in any case the sect means contribution to the management of the sect and thereby a - however small - material security of the novice; in the movement of Jesus however the renunciation does not mean contribution but a giving away which places the person who renounces also for the material life totally in insecurity and thus in dependence on God. One has to judge that, concerning the insecurity of man, Jesus proceeds more radically than the sect.'<sup>1</sup> We may add here: on the whole, the early Church - and until now Christian monasticism - followed the line of the sect rather than that of Mt xix,21 (cf. Acts ii.43-47; v.1-11). And in this connection it is worth noting that Acts v.4 'suggests that this was not an universal rule.'<sup>2</sup>

Since dependence on the sect in the matter of the first condition for Jesus himself is doubtful, we may compare it too with similar conditions found in the 'entrance-liturgy' Ps xv:

'who does not put out his money at interest,  
and does not take a bribe against the innocent.'<sup>3</sup> (Ps xv.5)<sup>3</sup>

If we take these two conditions together, we may formulate their meaning: renunciation of unlawful money or possessions. It is a far cry from this condition to Jesus' condition, if we have to understand the latter as renunciation of all possessions.

But is this really the meaning of Mt v.3? A comparison between Luke xii.32-34 and Matthew vi. 19-21 shows that there are two lines of understanding within the synoptic tradition. Luke's version in the verses 33-34 obviously is secondary, for he recasts the clear parallelism visible in Matthew's version.<sup>4</sup> Yet the Lucan

---

1 H. BRAUN, Radikalismus II, p. 79/80.

2 OAB, n. to Acts ii.44.

3 Cf. OAB, n. to this verse: 'The prohibition of interest (Ex 22.25; Lev. 25.35-37) has reference to charitable loans made for the relief of distress rather than to the purely business type of loan which became common in a later commercial age.'

4 So also R. BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 93.

context still suggests that the original context was that of the Sermon on the Mount (cf. Lk xii. 22-31//Mt vi. 25-34; Lk xii. 33-34//Mt vi. 19-21). Furthermore it is probable that the saying Lk xii. 32<sup>1</sup> and the editorial formulation 33a refers to the first condition of admission to the kingdom:

'Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.  
Sell your possessions, and give alms; ... (for) Blessed are the poor, for yours is the  
kingdom of God' (Lk vi. 20).

This is to say, in Luke's view the first condition of Jesus implies the renunciation of all material possessions. This is confirmed by his formulation of the first woe;

But woe to you that are rich ( τοῖς πλουσίοις ),  
for you have received your consolation. (Lk vi. 24)<sup>2</sup>

If we may take Mt vi. 19-21 into account for the interpretation of Mt v. 3, we note a shift of emphasis:

Do not lay up for yourselves treasures on earth,  
where moth and rust consume  
and where thieves break in and steal,  
but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven,  
where neither moth nor rust consumes  
and where thieves do not break in and steal.  
For where your treasure is,  
there will your heart be also.

Whereas Luke - as vi. 24 shows - has in mind the rich men of the congregation only,<sup>3</sup> Matthew's version speaks to all: Do not make it the purpose of your life to 'lay up for yourselves treasures on earth'. The reason why a follower of Christ must not do this is not primarily the difficulty of hiding it safely in house or field,<sup>4</sup> but the empirical fact 'where your treasure is, there will your heart be also' (21). W. MICHAELIS rightly says, '... it is an error to believe that one can care for earthly values and nevertheless reserve one's heart for God. A person

---

1 R. BULTMANN, *ibid.*, p. 111, holds The Little Flock to be a 'quite secondary community formulation'; this is probable also because here the giving of the kingdom is envisaged in the future only.

2 Cf. also Luke's expression in xvi. 9: 'unrighteous mammon', which seems to suggest that material possessions in themselves are 'unrighteous'.

3 See also James v. 1-6: 'Come now, you rich ...'

4 Cf. A. M. HUNTER, *Design*, p. 77.

cannot divide himself in two (vi.24). Only he who wants to be rich in God alone (Lk xii.21), he has his heart at the right place.<sup>1</sup>

If we take the cultic situation 'before the gate' of Mt v.3 earnestly, then, we come to the conclusion that this condition - over against Mt vi. 19-21 par. - merely stresses the negative aspect 'poor in spirit', which however - over against Mt vi.24 par. and Luke's interpretation - is not to be narrowed to 'Mammon' or material possessions only. Consequently, the essence of the first condition is this: **The renunciation of all attachments.**

To his disciples who had answered, We have renounced all attachments, Jesus pronounces his blessing:

"Blessed are the poor in spirit (οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι),  
for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

According to a cultic interpretation these 'good tidings to the poor' (cf. Is lxi.1, LXX: εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ) first of all mean one thing, namely: for God has become their King. At this stage of the Beatitudes the choice is between all earthly attachments and the heavenly King. 'There can be no half-way house and no divided allegiance: and only those who accept God as King without reservations are members of his Kingdom.'<sup>2</sup> - What is the next condition for the initiants?

(2) **The Second Beatitude (Mt v.4//Lk vi.21b).** - Luke's version,

"Blessed are you that weep now,  
for you shall laugh" -

points the way to the cultic interpretation, namely to 'ritual weeping and laughing' found especially in Ugaritic texts.<sup>3</sup> There, the weeping is associated with the death of the deity. This is, of course, not Luke's own view. He rather seems to understand the present Beatitude in the sense that the coming of the Saviour is 'good news of a great joy' (Lk ii.10,11).

1 W. MICHAELIS, Mt I, p. 341.

2 T. W. MANSON, Teaching, p. 193.

3 See above p. 114, n.2.



It is well known that Matthew's version refers to Is lxi.2: '... to comfort all who mourn' (LXX: παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας). As the 'Comforter' was a Messianic designation<sup>1</sup>, it is quite probable that the final editor of Matthew understood this Beatitude in the sense that God through his Messiah will comfort Israel.<sup>2</sup> In this case, however, it is difficult to recognise here an aspect of 'condition'.

A cultic interpretation has to start with the question, What is the meaning of the condition 'He who mourns' (οἱ πενθοῦντες)? If it is correct that this second condition is preceded by a formula of initiation into God's kingdom, the next step must show to the disciples what this implies. At this point Jesus teaches his disciples to look at the kingdom with the right attitude, viz. with 'mourning' because of its present state. This situation probably is reflected also in the 'prophetic liturgy' Is xxxiii.7-9:

Behold, the valiant ones cry without;  
the envoys of peace weep bitterly.  
The highways lie waste,  
the wayfaring man ceases,  
Covenants are broken,  
witnesses are despised,  
there is no regard for man.  
The land mourns and languishes;  
Lebanon is confounded and withers away;  
Sharon is like a desert;  
and Bashan and Carmel shake off their leaves.

The last colon of this poem seems to refer to autumn and thus to the state of nature which caused the people of ancient Near East to lament the death of their deity. If this is correct, it is not unreasonable to assume that it points to the New Year Festival, the climax of which is the celebration of the resurrection of the deity. This

1 Cf. A. M. HUNTER, *Design*, p. 32.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, "They shall be comforted". These words contain a veiled claim to Messiahship. It is as if Jesus said, "Yes, and I will be their comforter".

event probably is reflected in the following verse 10:

"Now I will arise", says the Lord,  
 "now I will lift myself up;  
 now I will be exalted. ..."

Since in Israel the feature of the resurrection of the deity is replaced by the conception of the Enthronement of Yahweh on Mount Zion, it is a matter of no surprise that the negative aspect of mourning is not found in the Enthronement psalms. In the context of the Beatitudes, however, the condition of mourning has a deep sense: it was an expression of deep sorrow over the dark reality of the Land of Israel, both political and spiritual.<sup>1</sup> Thus 'He who mourns' is to be understood as solidarity with the 'sons of the kingdom' i.e. the people of Israel.

To the disciples who had answered, We mourn, Jesus pronounced his blessing:

"Blessed are those who mourn,  
 for they shall be comforted."

Luke says, 'for you shall laugh'. The Enthronement psalms are full of rejoicing:

O come, let us sing to the Lord;  
 let us make a joyful noise to the rock of our salvation!  
 Let us come into his presence with thanksgiving;  
 let us make a joyful noise to him with songs of praise!  
 For the Lord is a great God,  
 and a great King above all gods. (Ps xcv.1-3)<sup>2</sup>  
 Make a joyful noise to the Lord, all the lands!  
 Serve the Lord with gladness!  
 Come into his presence with singing!  
 Know that the Lord is God!  
 It is he that made us, and we are his;  
 we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture.  
 Enter his gates with thanksgiving,  
 and his courts with praise!  
 Give thanks to him, bless his name! (Ps c.1-4).

---

1 Cf. J. KLAUSNER, Jesus, p. 201: 'And such a king-messiah, a saviour both political and spiritual, the people at first saw also in Jesus ...'.

2 See also Pss xcvi.1ff., 11f; xcvi. 1, 11-12; xcvi.4ff.

The reason for the joy expressed in the Enthronement psalms and, accordingly, for the comfort promised to the initiants, is that God comes to judge the earth, or, in other words: Yahweh has become King. However, the future tense of Mt v.4b is justified in so far as the effect of God's Enthronement, i.e. the salvation of Israel and the nations (cf. Ps xcvi.2), lies still in the future. Nevertheless, salvation is already a cultic reality, and therefore the worshippers are summoned to 'make a joyful noise before the King, the Lord' (Ps xcvi.6b) now. - At this point, the disciples of Jesus may have asked: 'What then shall we do?' (cf. Lk iii.10)

(3) The Third Beatitude (Mt v.5 // no par. in Lk) - This Beatitude has been suspected to be secondary because of its changing position within the Beatitudes and its dependence on Ps xxxvii.11.<sup>1</sup> In fact, the idea expressed in v.5 is most important for the time of Jesus.

Who is 'He who is meek' (οἱ πραεῖς) ? JOSEPH KLAUSNER explains, 'In Galilee were to be found neither Pharisees learned in the Law nor Sadduceans or Boethuseans, nor any of the richer and more powerful classes who acquiesced in Roman domination; there remained only the two dissimilar types: Zealots of the party founded by Judah the Galilaean and Zadok the Pharisee, numerous in Galilee (though not as a sect) from the time of Hezekiah the Galilean; and the "meek upon earth" and the many varieties of the mystic, visionary type - "quietist Pharisees", Essenes, and the like. All who had strength enough to take up a sword joined themselves with the Zealots; the rest were more or less akin in spirit to the "meek upon earth" who abandoned interest in temporal things to dream of a future life, a life based on the ethics of the Prophets and the messianic idea.'<sup>2</sup> KLAUSNER's view of the "meek upon earth" needs qualification: He overlooks the possibility that some of them would not fight rather than 'could not fight for their country's freedom against the might of Rome'.<sup>3</sup>

1 Cf. W. MICHAELIS, Mt I, p. 202.

2 J. KLAUSNER, Jesus, p. 173.

3 *ibid.*, p. 228; the rest of the sentence reads, '... but the messianic promise served them instead.' Cf. also *ibid.*: 'From this circle of "the meek upon earth" came Jesus of Nazareth, and in him all this confused ferment of views received powerful and unique expression.'



According to the synoptic tradition, it goes without saying that Jesus shared the view of the "meek upon earth". On the other hand, at least one of his disciples, namely 'Simon who was called the Zealot' (Lk vi.15; Acts i.13)<sup>1</sup>, seems to have been a former member of the party of the Zealots, and until the last day of Jesus' ministry it was obviously difficult for the disciples to accept the present condition.<sup>2</sup> This is evident from the saying Mt xxvi.52:

Put your sword back into its place;  
for all who take the sword  
will perish by the sword.

At the same moment, i.e. when Jesus was taken captive, Jesus refers to the fact that his own view is public knowledge:

Have you come out as against a robber ( *ἡστῆς* ),

with swords and clubs to capture me? (Mt xxvi.55 // Mk xiv.48; cf. Lk xxii.52)

Since the 'Lestai' can be identical with the Zealots,<sup>3</sup> Jesus most probably defends himself against the assumption that he is a Zealot.

The condition 'He who is meek', then, is to be interpreted as renunciation of violence.

To the disciples who agreed to be meek, Jesus pronounced this blessing:

Blessed are the meek,  
for they shall inherit the earth.

( *ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν* )

(Cf. *γ* xxxvi.11a: *οἱ δὲ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσιν γῆν* )

The meaning of this promise has been recognised long ago. JOHANNES WEISS said, "To these persons who at present stand at the lowest stage of the rank in the kingdom of God is promised that they participate in the reign of God, that they shall rule over the earth. ... We have to do here with the hope expressed, e.g. in the

1 See however Mk iii.18//Mt x.4: 'Simon the Cananaean'.

2 See J. PICKL, *Messias König Jesus*, pp. 181ff: 35. Die letzte Klärung der apostolischen Messias Hoffnung.

3 See *ibid.*, pp. 240ff: III Die geschichtlichen Wandlungen des Begriffes: Lestes ( *ἡστῆς* ), and esp. p.244 (ref: War 4, 3, 12). - It is worth noting in this connection that J. PICKL finds a reference to the Lestai also in Mk xi.17 par: 'Bandenhöle' ( *σπηλαίον ἡστῶν* ). (p.57) This links up with Matthew's quotation of Zech ix.9 in the context of the Entry ('humble and mounted on an ass' ( *πραὺς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον*, Mt xxi.5; see above p. 41). Thus Jesus demonstration of his mission has an anti-Zealotic aspect: 'His ass, the animal of peace, must protest against so many obstinate hopes of rebellion in those hearts.' (p.56).

Book of Daniel, that at the end of days the world dominion is granted to the people of God. In the mouth of the Messianic prophets this essentially is a political hope. The impossible situation that Gentiles reign over the world and especially over the chosen people shall cease, and at last Israel shall dominate.' For Jesus himself, 'That God will take the government is essential, and these pious persons are called blessed because they participate in it.'<sup>1</sup>

Hence participation in the reign of God is promised to those who refuse to take up a sword and join the party of the Zealots. The basis of this promise is evident from the last stanza of Ps. xxxvii:

The salvation of the righteous is from the Lord;  
he is their refuge in the time of trouble.  
The Lord helps them and delivers them;  
he delivers them from the wicked, and saves them,  
because they take refuge in him. (39, 40)

The point is this: God alone can restore the kingdom to his people.

(4) The Fourth Beatitude (Mk v.6 // Lk vi.21a) - The main question here is, Was the expression 'for righteousness' (τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ) interpolated by the final redaction of Matthew? 'Dikaosune' is a favourite term with the Gospel of Matthew; Mk does not use it at all, Lk only once (i.75) and Mt seven times, of that five times in the Sermon on the Mount, viz. in v.6,10,20; vi.1,33. G. STRECKER arrives at the following conclusion: 'All instances of the term δικαιοσύνη are inserted by the evangelist, and that in three instances (iii.15; v.6 and vi. 33) through interpolation into the existent context; at the other places the context too originates from the redactor.'<sup>2</sup>

It is well known that the term 'dikaosune' joins together the Sermon on the Mount into a consistent whole. If this link is editorial - what other link is there left? Recalling the fact that 'righteousness belongs to a group of terms denoting relationship'<sup>3</sup>, and the prominent place of the concept of perfection -

---

1 J. WEISS, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Erster Band (2nd ed.) Göttingen 1907, p.260.

2 G. STRECKER, op. cit. p.153.

3 See above p. 132.

the Hebrew equivalent of which, i.e. *tamim*, belongs to the same group - in the liturgy of the temple-cult, we suggest that this concept dominates not only the Beatitudes but the whole of the Sermon as far as it is authentic. In fact, the difference between the editorial interpretation of the Sermon and the cultic interpretation is small but decisive: whereas the former stresses the moral or ethical aspect, i.e. the relationship between man and man - without losing the relationship between God and man however - , the emphasis of the latter interpretation is on the relationship between God and man.

There is no need to 'hunger and thirst for righteousness' in a cultic situation 'before the gates', for 'righteousness' can be used as a summary for the conditions of admission for the Temple (cf. Ps cxviii.19,20). On the other hand, Luke's formulation, 'Blessed are you that hunger now', which refers to a social and material situation does not fit here either. If there is anything in a cultic approach to the Beatitudes, the meaning of the fourth condition most probably is this: 'He who hungers and thirsts', namely for G o d H i m s e l f . The well-known Ps xlii is an apt illustration for this interpretation:

As a hart longs for flowing streams,  
 so longs my soul for thee, O God.  
 My soul thirsts for God, for the living God.  
 When shall I come and behold the face of God?  
 My tears have been my food day and night,  
 while men say to me continually,  
 "Where is your God?"  
 These things I remember, as I pour out my soul:  
 how I went with the throng,  
 and led them in procession to the house of God,  
 with glad shouts and songs of thanksgiving,  
 a multitude keeping festival. (1-4)

The fourth condition may be formulated as follows: *Desire for God*.

Hence, Jesus most probably said  
 "Blessed are those who hunger and thirst,  
 for they shall be satisfied."

---



What is the meaning of this promise? In accordance with the previous promise, we may answer: The disciples of Jesus shall experience God's coming which means salvation and victory.<sup>1</sup> This feature is present in the following two summons to worship, which most probably refer to the Enthronement of Yahweh:

O sing to the Lord a new song;  
sing to the Lord, all the earth!  
Sing to the Lord, bless his name;  
tell of his salvation from day to day.  
Declare his glory among the nations,  
his marvellous works among all the peoples! (Ps xcvi. 1-3)

O sing to the Lord a new song,  
for he has done marvellous things!  
His right hand and his holy arm  
have gotten him victory.  
The Lord has made known his victory,  
he has revealed his vindication  
in the sight of the nations.  
He has remembered his steadfast love and faithfulness  
to the house of Israel.  
All the ends of the earth have seen  
the victory of our God. (Ps xcvi. 1-3)

(5) The Fifth Beatitude (Mt v.7; cf. Lk vi.36) - When we formulate Mt v.7 as a condition, 'He who is merciful' (οἱ ἐλεήμονες), it is not impossible to assume that Luke omitted this particular Beatitude because he reformulated another saying contained in the Sermon in the same sense, viz: 'Be merciful ...' (Lk vi.36; cf. Mt v.48). But however this may be, 'mercy' is an attribute of God himself<sup>2</sup>. Since the third promise was participation in the reign of God and the fourth the experience of his victory, the question now arises: What about his adversaries? 'Revenge' followed after every enthronement of a king in the ancient Near East - and this idea was adopted by Israel together with the concept of enthronement, both in

1 Cf. A. M. HUNTER, *Design*, p. 34: 'They shall see the victory of God and good.' See also FRANK MOORE CROSS, Jr. *The Ancient Library of Qumran. A Modern Biblical Studies*, London 1958, p. 67, who holds that the present promise refers to the idea of an eschatological banquet.

2 A. M. HUNTER, *ibid.*, p. 34.

the political and in the religious sphere. In connection with the enthronement of Yahweh, the idea of revenge is found in Ps xciv. 1-3 and Ps xcvi. 1-5:

O Lord, thou God of vengeance,  
 thou God of vengeance, shine forth!  
 Rise up, O judge of the earth;  
 render the proud their deserts!  
 O Lord, how long shall the wicked,  
 how long shall the wicked exult?  
 The Lord has become King; let the earth rejoice;  
 let the many coastlands be glad!  
 Clouds and thick darkness are round about him;  
 righteousness and justice are the foundation of his throne.  
 Fire goes before him,  
 and burns up his adversaries round about.  
 His lightnings lighten the world;  
 the earth sees and trembles.  
 The mountains melt like wax before the Lord,  
 before the Lord of all the earth.

Against this background, the condition, 'He who is merciful' means: renunciation of revenge.<sup>1</sup>

To his disciples who said, We renounce revenge, Jesus pronounces the blessing:

Blessed are the merciful,  
 for they shall obtain mercy (ἐλεηθῶσινται).

We may take the Parable of the Unmerciful Servant to be an illustration for this Beatitude: 'Therefore the kingdom of heaven may be compared to a king who wished to settle accounts with his servants. ... (Mt xviii. 23ff.) The vital point is in verse 33: '... and should not you have mercy on your fellow servant, as I have mercy on you?' If the disciple knows his own need for mercy, he will be able not only to renounce revenge but to be an instrument of God's mercy.

---

1 Cf. J. JEREMIAS, *Verheissung*, pp. 35ff: A Jesus entfernt die Rache aus der eschatologischen Erwartung - On the ground of Lk iv. 16ff., Mt xi. 5f. par. Lk vii. 22f., the author shows that Jesus eliminates the feature of eschatological revenge and replaces it by God's mercy.

(6) The Sixth Beatitude (Mt v.8; no par. in Lk) - The relationship between the present Beatitude and Ps xxiv.4a is generally recognised. If we reformulate Mt v.8a as a condition, the similarity is so striking that we may assume direct dependence:

He who is pure in heart (οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ).

He who has clean hands and a pure heart.

(LXX: ἁθῶος χερσὶν καὶ καθαρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ )

What is the meaning of this condition? W. MICHAELIS suggests, 'Since according to the Pharisaic conceptions of cleanness uncleanness disqualifies for visit to the Temple, for study of Scripture, even for prayer, one could presume that the purity of heart refers to devotion to God (cf. 2 Tim ii. 22).'<sup>1</sup> This suggestion is correct, not only according to Pharisaic tradition but above all according to Ps xxiv.4a, which is part of an 'entrance-liturgy'

When we compare Ps xxiv.4a with the condition of admission to the sanctuary mentioned in Ps xv. 2a, namely,

He who walks perfectly,

we find that these two conditions are quite similar in meaning. As we have seen above<sup>2</sup>, both the expression 'pure in heart' and the term 'tammim' belong to the Old Testament concept of perfection. A. M. HUNTER says, 'Yet to be "pure in heart" does not mean to be clean of every stain of sin, i.e. morally perfect. Jesus, who came to call sinners, knew that none of us is sinless. Purity of heart stands rather for single-mindedness or sincerity.'<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, what is required here is perfection in the Hebrew meaning, i.e. integrity, wholeness, and that in relation to God.

Hence we may paraphrase the condition 'He who is pure in heart' as follows: He whose heart, i.e. centre of being, is undivided or whole in relation to God. Over against this, 'He who walks perfectly' is the Israelite who in all his 'ways', i.e. activities, life, is sound or whole in relation to God. If we take the 'clean hands' in Ps. xxiv.4a to refer mainly to acts, and the 'pure heart' mainly to attitude, and furthermore consider the fact that the first part is omitted by Jesus, the meaning of the sixth condition is quite clear:

1 W. MICHAELIS, *Mt I*, p. 218; however, this author prefers - on the ground of 1 Tim i.5, 1 Pet i.22 - to understand this Beatitude as referring to the relationship between man and man (Verhältnis zum Nächsten).

2 See above p. 145f.

3 A. M. HUNTER, *Design*, p. 35.



Wholeheartedness in relation to God.<sup>1</sup>

To the disciples who answered, We are pure in heart, Jesus pronounced the blessing:

Blessed are the pure in heart,

for they shall see God ( τὸν θεὸν ὄψονταί ).

'To see God' is a cultic expression.<sup>2</sup> In the temple festivals of the ancient Near East it denoted not only a 'spiritual vision' of the deity, but was 'attached to a visible symbol', in Israel probably to the holy ark of Yahweh. Since the existence of a visible symbol on the Mount of the Sermon is not very probable, we have to look for another interpretation. In Ps xxvii.<sup>4</sup> we read,

One thing have I asked of the Lord,

that will I seek after;

that I may dwell in the house of the Lord

all the days of my life,

to behold the beauty of the Lord

(LXX: τοῦ θεωρεῖν με τὴν τρεπρότητα τοῦ κυρίου )

and to inquire in his temple.

The speaker in this psalm probably is 'a temple functionary, a Levite'.<sup>3</sup> G. VON RAD comments upon this passage, 'Here is expressed, what is implied by dwelling in the house of Yahweh: it is bound up with a vision of God. ... If we are to understand the essence of this vision of God, of which the psalmist is speaking here, more clearly, we should have to proceed from Ex xxxiii.18ff., where we have a report about the appearance of the *tubh* YHWH. *Tubh* YHWH and *no'am* YHWH certainly mean the same, just as Ps xxvii speaks some verses later (vs. 13) about the vision of the *tubh* YHWH. There is, according to our view, no doubt that the pericope Ex xxxiii.18ff. (as other in Ex xxxiii too) served as a cult aetiology; they legitimate a rite which was celebrated in the sense of a theophany or else as a substitute for a theophany: call upon Yahweh by the congregation - the passing of Yahweh - the proclamation of the name of Yahweh and His titles of grace by Yahweh - prostration of the congregation.'<sup>4</sup> The last point of this liturgy might throw some light on the

1 Cf. above p. 149.

2 See above p. 146, n.1 (S. MOWINCKEL, Psalms I, p. 142).

3 OAB, n. ad loc.

4 G. VON RAD, Studien AT, p. 239.

enigmatic sentence Mt xvii. 6 in the context of the so-called 'Transfiguration': 'When the disciples heard this, they fell on their faces, and were filled with awe.' Actually this feature - which is reported by Matthew alone - confirms our conclusion that we have to do there essentially with a theophany.

The significance of the cultic theophany for the life of the faithful is evident from Ps lxiii.2-4:

So I have looked upon thee in the sanctuary,  
 beholding thy power and glory.  
 Because thy steadfast love is better than life,  
 my lips will praise thee.  
 So I will bless thee as long as I live;  
 I will lift up my hands and call on thy name.

We note first that the experience of God's presence in the cult (vs. 2a) gives the Israelite the courage for prayer (4b). Second, the 'beholding' of God's power and glory most probably means participation in God's power and glory (cf. vs. 8).

When we consider the context of initiation into the kingdom of God, it is interesting that the present promise does not read, 'for they shall see the King'. In the prophetic liturgy Is xxxiii, right after the conditions for admission, there are some lines which probably refer to an epiphany of God as King:

Your eyes will see the King in his beauty;<sup>1</sup>  
 (LXX: βασιλέα μετὰ δόξης ὄψεσθε )  
 they will behold a land that stretches afar. (17)

Look upon Zion, the city of our appointed feasts:  
 Your eyes will see Jerusalem,  
 a quiet habitation, an immovable tent,  
 whose stakes will never be plucked up,  
 nor will any of its cords be broken.  
 But there the Lord in majesty will be for us  
 a place of broad rivers and streams,

---

1 Cf. however OAB, ad loc: 'The unpleasant past (28,11-13) will become a memory in the peaceful reign of the Messianic king.' See vs. 22, and also The Call of Isaiah, esp. vi.5: '... for my eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts.'

where no galley with oars can go,  
 nor stately ship can pass.  
 For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our ruler,  
 the Lord is our King; he will save us. (20-22)

However vs. 17 may be understood, vs. 22 is an apt definition for 'the kingdom of heaven' expected by the 'meek upon earth' and - to a certain extent - by Jesus.

Even if it is difficult for us to imagine the event denoted by Jesus' promise, 'for they shall see God (ὁ ὤψοι τὰς)', there is no doubt about its essence, namely: the disciples shall experience a theophany. If there is anything in AUGUSTINE's suggestion that 'the Beatitudes mark the stages traversed towards perfection', the highest stage - according to our own view<sup>1</sup> - is already reached in the sixth Beatitude: Jesus required from his disciples to be wholly turned to God - and promises that God shall turn to them. Hence, the realisation of perfection is effected when God reveals himself in Person to the disciples and offers them the fullness of his communion.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, in spite of the conditions which must be fulfilled on the part of the disciples, perfection is not an achievement of man, but is the grace of God.

(7) The Seventh Beatitude (Mt v.9; no par. in Lk) - 'The Greek word "eirenopoioi" should be taken in its active sense of "peace-making", not in the passive one of "peaceable".<sup>3</sup> What is the meaning, then, of the condition, 'He who makes peace'? W. FOERSTER says, 'As the LXX translated nearly all instances of shalom of the Hebrew text and only them by εἰρηνότης, the Hebrew context thereby entered the Greek word.'<sup>4</sup> The basic meaning of shalom is 'wellbeing', and that above all in the material sense.<sup>5</sup>

1 For AUGUSTINE's own view cf. J. J. JEPSON, op. cit. Introduction p. 6: 'The seventh Beatitude reaches the highest stage of perfection, signifying as it does, peace; and peace is identical with wisdom. There is nothing more perfect than wisdom because it is contemplation of truth which in turn tranquilizes the whole of man and assumes the likeness of God.'

2 Cf. above p. 157.

3 A. M. HUNTER, *Design*, p. 36.

4 W. FOERSTER, art. eirene, in: *TWNT II*, p.405.

5 Cf. G. VON RAD, *ibid.*, p. 400.



Of special interest for our present context is the oracle of assurance delivered by a priest or Temple prophet,<sup>1</sup> which is reported in Ps lxxxv. 8-13:

Let me hear what God the Lord will speak,  
 for he will speak peace (shalom) to his people,  
 (LXX: ὅτι λαλήσας εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ )  
 to his saints, to those who turn to him in their hearts.  
 Surely his salvation is at hand for those who fear him,  
 that glory (kabodh// δόξαν ) may dwell in our land.  
 Steadfast love and faithfulness will meet;  
 righteousness and peace (cedeq w<sup>e</sup> shalom) will kiss each other.  
 (LXX: δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη κατεφίλησαν )  
 Faithfulness will spring up from the ground,  
 and righteousness will look down from the sky.  
 Yes, the Lord will give what is good,  
 and our land will yield its increase.  
 Righteousness will go before him,  
 and make his footsteps a way.

C. A. BRIGGS comments on vs. 9b: 'that the glory of the divine theophanic presence may again come to the land, as in ancient times, and dwell as the Shekinah in the Holy of Holies of the temple, the palace of the king Yahweh.'<sup>2</sup> This is the same idea as found in the sixth promise. The vital point in this oracle is the belief that shalom comes from God. 'The way in which, in this train of thought, God's attitude of salvation towards his people is conceived as cause of a perfect earthly peace, is a peak in the Old Testament use of the term shalom.'<sup>3</sup> If the material aspect is strong here (cf. vs. 12), the spiritual aspect doubtless is prominent in Is xlv. 7:

I form light and create darkness,  
 I make weal (shalom) and create woe,  
 (LXX: ὁ ποιῶν εἰρήνην καὶ κτίων κακὰ)  
 I am the Lord, who do all these things.<sup>4</sup>

1 OAB, n. ad loc.

2 C. A. BRIGGS, *Psalms II*, p. 233.

3 G. VON RAD, *ibid.*, p. 402.

4 On this text and our following discussion see H. WINDISCH, *Friedensbringer - Gottessöhne*, (Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Interpretation der 7. Seligpreisung, in: *ZNW*, 1925, 24. Bd. Heft 3/4, pp. 245ff.

Furthermore, the concept of shalom is part of the Old Testament eschatology: the messianic king is the 'Prince of Peace' (sar shalom). 'The name means that the Messiah as commissioner of God (sar), is the guarantor and guardian of peace in the coming Messianic kingdom.'<sup>1</sup> Over against the word 'tamim' which - as a religious term - is applied to individual persons, 'shalom is much more often applied to a multitude'<sup>2</sup>, it is markedly social.

In the New Testament εἰρήνη refers to 'peace' either between God and men<sup>3</sup>, or between men and men<sup>4</sup>. The best example for the former cases, which are only few, is Rom v.1: '... we have peace with God (εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν) through our Lord Jesus Christ.' Of course, the two aspects of peace cannot be separated altogether. In a cultic context, however, it is reasonable to stress the relation to God. Hence we may say, 'He who makes peace' is the disciple who actively attempts to reconcile men with God and men with men (cf. Cor v.18f).<sup>5</sup> In other words, the seventh condition means: Participation in God's saving activity.

To the disciples who pledged, 'We are peacemakers', Jesus pronounced the blessing:

Blessed are the peacemakers,

for they shall be called sons of God ( υἱοὶ θεοῦ ).

It is quite clear that this Beatitude presupposes the realisation of perfection. This is to say, only he can participate in God's saving activity, who knows God, i.e. who experienced communion with him.<sup>6</sup> It is very significant, moreover, that Jesus did not say,

Blessed are the perfect, i.e. the pure in heart,

for they shall be called sons of God.

This implies that sonship in the view of Jesus is conditioned also by obedience (cf. Mt vii.24-27 par.). The will

1 G. VON RAD, *ibid.*, p. 404.

2 *ibid.*, p. 405.

3 Cf. W. FOERSTER, *ibid.* p. 413f.

4 Cf. *ibid.* p. 414f.

5 Cf. however, *ibid.* p. 418, where FOERSTER interprets Mt v.9 in accordance with the rabbinic 'sh shalom as making peace between men and men in the narrow sense.

6 See above p. 291.

of the Father who is in heaven must be the dominating factor in the life of the son (cf. Mt vii. 21-23). Hence we have to do here with a *d y n a m i c* conception of sonship.

We may recall here the prophecy of Hosea to disobedient Israel: '... and the place where it was said to them, "You are not my people", it shall be said to them, "Sons of the living God".' (i. 10b) Th. DE KRUIJF comments on this verse, 'with the prophets the emphasis lies on this tension between the present of Israel as the disobedient son and the idealised past on the one hand, and the expected and promised future on the other hand.'<sup>1</sup>

In the cult, that tension - to a certain extent - is suspended in 'contemporaneity'<sup>2</sup>, and the disciples accordingly must be regarded as 'sons of God' at the moment of initiation or adoption. This is confirmed by Mt v. 13, 'You are the salt of the earth ...', and 14, 'You are the light of the world...'. Matthew's formulation - which we hold to be authentic<sup>3</sup> - makes it clear that the new status of the disciples, i.e. 'perfection', 'sonship', involves a new task. This new task of the circle of the disciples is in line with the seventh condition for admission to the kingdom of heaven, i.e. to be peacemakers, as is evident from the following statement, which refers to Mt v. 13-16: 'It (sc. the circle of disciples) exists in order to be, through its word, its ways and its existence and character the handmaid, even the instrument of the merciful dominion of God over the world.'<sup>4</sup>

For a better understanding of the significance of the sonship of the disciples of Jesus, we may compare it with a similar concept in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The members of the sect are called 'the sons of light'<sup>5</sup>. It is, however - as a matter of task - a far cry from Jesus' 'sons of God' to the sect's 'sons of light': whereas the former are called to participate in God's saving activity, the latter prepare 'the unslashing of the attack of the sons of light against the company of the sons of darkness, the army of Satan: against the band of Edom, Moab,

---

1 Th. DE KRUIJF, *Der Sohn*, p. 6.

2 See above p. 265.

3 See below p. 299.

4 J. B. SOUCEK, art. cit. p. 174.

5 Cf. 1 QS i. 9; ii. 9; iii. 13, 24, 25; 1 QM i. 1, 3, 9, 11, 13.



and the sons of Ammon, and (against the army of the sons of the East and) the Philistines, and against the bands of the Kittim of Assyria and their allies the ungodly of the Covenant.<sup>1</sup> Hence we may conclude that whereas the 'sons of light' were - in their own eyes - members of a saved 'remnant', the 'sons of God' in the seventh Beatitude were members of a saving 'remnant'.<sup>2</sup>

(8) The Eighth Beatitude (Mt v.10; no par. in Lk) - R. BULTMANN holds Mt. v.10 to be 'a Matthean formulation, intended to bring the number of beatitudes in vv.3-9 (v.5 is secondary in Matthew) up to seven',<sup>3</sup> and G. STRECKER judges it to be redactorial because it brings nothing new in the context.<sup>4</sup> Since the Beatitudes number nine and ten are also reported in Luke with only slight differences, and that in the same order and context, it could be argued that the first compiler interpolated the present Beatitude in order to get a Decalogue.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, the feature of 'persecution' - although it seems to collide at first sight with v.9<sup>6</sup> - cannot be missed after the foregoing context.<sup>7</sup> Our hypothesis, then, is this: Mt v.10 is authentic and originally belongs to the Beatitudes v.3-10, but 'for righteousness sake' (ἐνεκεν δικαιοσύνης) is a gloss added by the final editor,<sup>8</sup> as is 'for righteousness' in v.6; on the other hand Mt v.11,12 par. - which we hold to be authentic<sup>9</sup> - probably belongs to a later stage in Jesus' ministry, but was added to the first eight Beatitudes in order to get a Decalogue. This implies

1 QM i.1 (trans. G. VERMES, Scrolls, p. 124).

2 Cf. M. BLACK, Scrolls, p. 168: 'He (sc. the new covenant) became a member of an exclusive sect, of a saved Remnant (at least in its own eyes), but not a saving Remnant.' See also T.W. MANSON, Teaching, p. 179: 'The difference may be stated simply in this way, that whereas the Remnant was to be a saved few, the Servant of Jehovah is to be a saving few.'

3 R. BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 110.

4 G. STRECKER, op. cit. p. 151.

5 See above p. 262.

6 So W. MICHAELIS, Mt I, p. 225.

7 A. M. HUNTER, Design, p. 37, holds Mt v.11-12 to be a 'doublet' of verse 10 rather than vice versa, as G. STRECKER, *ibid.*, p. 151. ('Exzerpt' aus V. 11f.).

8 1 Pet iii.13, 'But even if you suffer for righteousness' sake, you will be blessed', which by A. M. HUNTER is called an echo of Mt v.10, (*ibid.* p. 36), actually refers to Ps xxxiv. 12-16, which is quoted in iii.10-12.

9 Cf. however, R. BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 110 (ex eventu ... created by the Church).

that the first compiler - probably in contrast to the final editor - was conscious of the relationship between the original eight Beatitudes which Jesus proclaimed on the Mount and the liturgy of the gate. This hypothesis is confirmed by the literary form of the eight Beatitudes, which - after eliminating the two editorial glosses - is uniform (Μακάριοι..., 3rd person, bicolon).

The foregoing hypothesis must be confirmed above all by the content of the eighth Beatitude. At first glance we recognise that the present saying refers back to the first Beatitude, for its second part is exactly identical with that of v.3, i.e. 'for theirs is the kingdom of heaven'. If it is correct to understand this expression in the sense of *i n i t i a t i o n* into the kingdom, its occurrence at this stage most probably means that all eight Beatitudes were part of the initiation rite celebrated on the Mount. Consequently, initiation is completed only after the last condition is fulfilled. It reads as follows: 'He who suffers persecution' (οἱ δεδιωγμένοι).

The persecution of the disciples is not a blind fate; they shall suffer for what they are, namely the true sons of the kingdom. It is clear that Mt v.10 refers to the 'suffering of the messianic age', or, to the 'pangs of the Messiah',<sup>1</sup> which are linked up with the coming of the kingdom. Hence, before the final blessing, which initiates the disciples definitively into the kingdom, they explicitly must state their readiness to face persecution.

Now, Jesus proclaims:

Blessed are those who are persecuted,  
for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Afterwards, all the disciples who entered the kingdom of heaven probably answered, 'Amen, Amen'. - This implies that the kingdom of heaven is inaugurated. Its manifestation to Israel and the world is only a question of time. Certainly, it will involve the suffering of persecution on the part of the disciples. But the fulfilment of God's purpose is sure, and the consummation of his kingdom at hand.

The confession of Peter - to which all synoptics attach so much importance - suggests that at the present stage the disciples did not yet realise the issue which may be put like this: the inauguration of the

---

1 For details see J. KLAUSNER, Jesus, p. 300f.

kingdom is impossible without the presence of the *Messiah*. Yet in the Sermon on the Mount there is no direct reference to the Messiah. Obviously it was not the way of Jesus to talk about his own role within the saving remnant. 'In all his work the Father is to be the paramount chief and the paramount interest; everything that he does is to be done for God, with God and under God.'<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, 'What he offers to men is not an academic doctrine but something which he has tried and proved in his own experience.'<sup>2</sup> This is true especially with respect to the conditions and promises Jesus proclaimed on the Mount of the Beatitudes:

1. Renunciation of all attachments / initiation into the kingdom of heaven.
2. Solidarity with the 'sons of the kingdom' / salvation of Israel and the nations.
3. Renunciation of violence / participation in the reign of God.
4. Desire for God / experience of God's coming.
5. Renunciation of revenge / grant of God's mercy.
6. Whole-heartedness in relation to God / theophany.
7. Participation in God's saving activity / divine sonship.
8. Readiness to face persecution / initiation into the kingdom of heaven.<sup>3</sup>

It goes without saying that Jesus himself fulfilled all these conditions and experienced the fulfilment of these promises. He is the first-born Son of God (cf. Heb xii.23), through whom God brought 'many sons to glory'. He is the 'pioneer of their salvation' and is himself made 'perfect through suffering' (cf. Heb. ii.10).<sup>4</sup>

---

1 T. W. MANSON, *Teaching*, p. 197.

2 *ibid.*, p. 198.

3 Compare this result of the cultic interpretation of the Beatitudes with the 'atomizing' treatment of the Matthean Beatitudes by T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, pp. 46 and 150; MANSON's view about the authentic form of the Beatitudes is this: There is no entirely satisfactory solution of this problem. It might, however, be conjectured that the earliest form of the section consists of the first three beatitudes with the corresponding woes; that the fourth beatitude - a genuine saying of Jesus - was added later; and that finally the fourth woe was produced to round off the whole.' (this refers to Luke's order, Lk vi. 20-26; *cit.* p. 49) Over against this we believe that the woes are entirely Luke's creation, for in their present form they cannot have been addressed to the disciples. (cf. *ibid.* p. 49) For curses in the context of initiation see 1 QS ii; they are foreign to the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount.

4 On the relationship between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Sermon on the Mount see below, Chapter IX.



### 3 The mission of the eschatological community

The section Mt v.13-16 certainly is one of the most popular in the New Testament. Nevertheless its scholarly interpretation is still far from being undisputed, at least as far as its literary form is concerned.

According to R. BULTMANN, the sayings about the salt (Mk ix.50 // Mt v. 13 // Lk xiv.34f.) and the light (Mk iv.21 // Mt v.15 // Lk xi.33) 'belong to secular meshalim which have been made into dominical sayings in the tradition'<sup>1</sup>. Their original meaning is unknown. 'It is plain that neither the evangelists' explanation nor the place that the sayings have in their context give us any information as to their original meaning.'<sup>2</sup> The present form of the two metaphorical sayings in Matthew is the work of editorial adaption: The introductions, 'You are the salt of the earth', or 'the light of the world', ascribe the sayings to the disciples.<sup>3</sup>

On the other hand, J. B. SOUČEK, who is less sceptical about the synoptic tradition, attempted to clarify the history of the two sayings. As a result of his investigation he holds - with others - , for example, that the strange expression in Mk iv.21, *ὅτι μὴτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος* ..., points to 'the eschatological event of the coming of the kingdom of God in Jesus'<sup>4</sup>. This implies that 'for Mark this promise stood in the light of the cross and the resurrection of Jesus'<sup>5</sup>. If our foregoing interpretation of the Beatitudes is correct, we note here a shift of emphasis: whereas Jesus proclaims the inauguration of the kingdom, i.e. its present reality, Mark points to the future: 'Be not afraid, if you do not see clear-cut, tangible proofs of the kingdom of God; hope in joyful perseverance for his certain coming.'<sup>6</sup>

---

1 R. BULTMANN, Tradition, p. 102.

2 *ibid.*, p. 98.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 91/92.

4 J. B. SOUČEK, *art. cit.* p. 172.

5 *ibid.*, p. 173.

6 *ibid.*, p. 172.

T. W. MANSON's approach to Mt v. 13-16 is this: 'The opening phrases, "Ye are the salt of the earth" and "Ye are the light of the world", suggest that both verses 13 and 14 are from one source. And since v. 14 has no parallel in Lk. we may perhaps assign both verses to M. Again, v. 16, which has no parallel in Lk., and is therefore presumably M, presupposes v. 15. Verse 15 has a parallel in Lk.; but the parallel is only partial. It may well be that the whole passage vv. 13-16 is to be assigned to M.<sup>1</sup> This is to say, from our view of the sources: the present form of Mt v. 13-16 probably is not the work of the final redaction but belongs to the oldest tradition. As to the position held by J. B. SOUČEK and most scholars<sup>2</sup>, it is not unreasonable to think that Jesus himself used the metaphors of salt and light on more than one occasion and in more than one way. Hence the instances outside the Sermon are not necessarily to be regarded as 'traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund' to our section. We may try, then, to apply a cultic interpretation to it.

First, the following questions must be considered: What is the function of the double 'You are ...'? Where do we find similar statements in the cult of the Temple? Although this model seems at first sight to be far fetched, the similarity in form between the 'You are ...' of Mt v. 13 and 14 and the so-called royal protocol<sup>3</sup> is unmistakable, if we take the Beatitudes as its original context into account. The two most important contents of the royal protocol or decree were - in Egypt as well as in Ps ii - the proclamation of the throne-names and the task of the new ruler.<sup>4</sup> Over against the Egyptian models, however, there is a new emphasis perceptible already in Ps ii: 'The anointed announces in vs. 7a a proclamation about a hoq of Yahweh, and in vs. 7b the content of the covenant of David is legally described. Thus in the passages mentioned (sc. Ps lxxxix.40; Ps cxxxii.12; 2 Kgs xi.12; Ps cv.10; Ps ii) hoq, 'eduth and b<sup>e</sup>rith are more or less synonymous for one and the same thing...'<sup>5</sup> Hence, although the concept of 'sonship' is mentioned in Ps ii.7, the emphasis in Israel is on the covenant with the house of David rather than on the physical origin of the anointed.<sup>6</sup> The vital point in view of Mt v. 13, 14

---

1 T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 152.

2 Cf. art. cit. p. 169.

3 See above p. 120; esp. n.2.

4 Cf. also G. VONRAD, *Studien AT*, p. 208.

5 *ibid.*, p. 210/11.

6 Cf. *ibid.* p. 211.

is this: 'In this royal protocol Y a h w e h speaks in direct speech to the king, calls him his son, enfeoffs him with the rule, mentions his throne-names, etc..<sup>1</sup> This is to say, the expression 'You are ...' in a cultic context points to a divine decree which is proclaimed by God himself.

'It is well known', G. VON RAD says, 'that in the Old Testament there is only one example of detailed royal titles, namely in the Messianic prophecy Is ix.5b. That the giving of titles by the deity belonged to the ritual of the Judaeen celebrations of enthronement is already proved by this text; for in this passage Isaiah does not present something which is entirely new, but he is, at least with respect to the form, dependent on a tradition.'<sup>2</sup> VON RAD holds that between the verses 5 and 6 of Is ix the speaker changes: the expression 'to us a child is born' in essence is identical with Ps ii.7, 'You are my son, today I have begotten you'. 'The anointed is "sar", i.e. commissioner in the kingdom of Yahweh.'<sup>3</sup> We already suggested above that in the deepest sense the condition in v. 9 is identical with the task of the 'Prince of Peace' in Is ix.6.<sup>4</sup> We note, moreover, that as the royal titles in 6b are preceded by the expression '... to us a son is given' in 6a, the 'titles' of the disciples in Mt v.13,14 is preceded by 'for they shall be called sons of God' in v. 9.

It is not improbable, then, that Is ix, 6-7, together with Ps ii.7, may be regarded as a background to our present section. And this would imply that the double 'You are ...' in Mt v.13,14 is to be interpreted as a *d i v i n e d e c r e e* to the eschatological congregation on the Mount, which defines her titles and mission.

(1) M a t t h e w v. 13. - The divine decree Mt v.13a is combined with an explanation:<sup>5</sup>

---

1 G. VON RAD, *ibid.*, p. 211.

2 *ibid.*, p. 211/12.

3 *ibid.*, p. 213.

4 See above p. 293.

5 Since the 'decrees' both in Ps ii (cf. vss. 8-9) and Is ix (cf. vs. 7) are followed by 'explanations', it is quite probable that this explanation - as well as that in 14b-16 - is authentic. This would be in accordance too with Jesus' way of teaching. As a matter of principle, the 'decree' alone is sufficient.



You are the salt of the earth;  
 but if the salt has lost its taste,  
 how shall saltiness be restored?  
 It is no longer good for anything  
 except to be thrown out  
 and trodden under foot by men.

That the salt might lose its taste may be described as an 'impossible possibility'.<sup>1</sup> Hence it is impossible for God's eschatological congregation to share in the lot of savourless salt: 'The casting out of the useless salt into the street, the common refuse-tip in the East, follows on the recognition of its utter worthlessness.'<sup>2</sup>

The explanation, then, is in line with the cultic interpretation of the title 'salt of the earth', for it means that the Lord God of Israel gave the kingship over the earth *forever* to Jesus and his disciples.<sup>3</sup> Theirs is an everlasting 'covenant of salt', i.e. God granted them perpetual communion. The fact that the 'earth' is mentioned rather than Israel is worth noting. Once more it is evident that Jesus derived his conception of the kingdom of heaven from the enthronement psalms and therefore stressed the universal dominion of Yahweh.<sup>4</sup> That the disciples were to participate in it was promised already in the third Beatitude.

(2) Matthew v. 14 - 16. - The present decree too is reported together with some explanations:

You are the light of the world;  
 A city set on a hill  
 cannot be hid.  
 Nor do men light a lamp  
 and put it under a bushel, but on a stand,  
 and it gives light to all in the house.

---

1 Cf. the anecdote concerning R. JOSHUA ben Chananiah quoted by T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 132.

2 *ibid.*, p. 132.

3 See above p. 87.

4 See above p. 100.

Let your light shine before men,  
 that they may see your good works  
 and give glory to your Father who is in heaven.

Again it is explicitly stated that the title of the disciples and the task implied in it is of cosmic significance (cf. τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου). T. W. MANSON remarks, 'In Rabbinical literature the title "light of the world" is given to God, Adam, Israel, the Law and the Temple, Jerusalem.'<sup>1</sup> For a cultic interpretation, Is ix.2 is of special importance, because this verse is followed by the divine decree vs. 6:

The people who walk in darkness  
 have seen a great light (LXX: φῶς μέγα);  
 those who dwelt in a land of deep darkness,  
 on them has light shined.

(LXX: φῶς λάμψαι ἐφ' ὑμᾶς)

This verse - together with Is ix. 1 - is quoted in Mt iv.15-16. It has been noted that this passage as a whole cannot be derived from the LXX.<sup>2</sup> 'The most important difference is that the masoretic text speaks in the perfect tense, while the Septuagint changed into the future, thereby rendering the "prophetic perfect tense" correctly. When Matthew again chooses the perfect tense, he states that the promise is fulfilled. ... : the despised Galilee comes to be the place of the eschatological fulfilment.'<sup>3</sup>

What is meant by the 'great light' which points to the fulfilment? It is obvious that the disciples themselves cannot be the source of the light. Consequently, we must imagine the situation similar to that in Is ix.2: '... on the has light shined'. The divine decree Mt v.14a in a sense is parallel to the divine decree to the 'Servant of Yahweh' in the following texts:

"I am the Lord, I have called you in righteousness,  
 I have taken you by the hand and kept you;  
 I have given you as a covenant to the people,  
 a light to the nations (LXX: εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν)  
 to open the eyes that are blind,  
 to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon,  
 from the prison those who sit in darkness.

1 T. W. MANSON, Sayings, p. 152.

2 Cf. e.g. G. STRECKER, op. cit. p. 63.

3 H. CONZELMANN, art. skotos, in: TWNT VII, p. 441.

I am the Lord, that is my name;

my glory (kh<sup>e</sup> bhodhi // τῆς δόξης ) I give to no other,  
nor my praise to graven images.

Behold, the former things have come to pass,

and new things I now declare;

before they spring forth I tell you of them." (Is xlii.6-9)

He (sc. God) says,

"It is too light a thing that you should be my servant

to raise up the tribes of Jacob

and to restore the preserved of Israel;

I will give you as a light to the nations,

that my salvation may reach the end of the earth." (Is xlix.6)

In his book mentioned above in our first chapter,<sup>1</sup> R. MARTIN-ACHARD also discusses the first and the second 'Servant song', and especially the two passages quoted here. 'It is the Servant's duty', he says, referring to Is xlii.1, 'to show plainly what Yahweh's judgment is. To the mind of Deutero-Isaiah, this verdict of Yahweh's is nothing less than God's forgiveness of His People, the triumphant return of the exiles to the Holy City, and the consolidation of the Holy Nation. The Servant is called to make known the work wrought by Yahweh on behalf of Israel; his task will not be finished until the whole world, dazzled and wondering, sees what Yahweh has done for His People.'<sup>2</sup>

MARTIN-ACHARD's comment on Is xlix.6 is this: 'As for his task, it too remains: Israel is to be gathered together (Is. xlix.5a), and the People of Yahweh restored (Is. xlix.6a). ... The heathen will learn of the redemption of the People of Israel; the salvation that Yahweh will have given his People will be praised to the ends of the earth. The humble task carried out by the Servant, unappreciated and even persecuted, will in fact shine out like a blaze of light upon all the peoples (Is. xlix.6b).'<sup>3</sup>

Again we ask, What is meant by this 'light'? The following sentences of MARTIN-ACHARD's conclusion about Deutero-Isaiah's message suggest that it may be understood against the background of Israel's most fundamental cultic experience, namely the epiphany of God in his holy Temple (cf. 1 Kg vii.11;

1 See above p. 66, n.1.

2 A. MARTIN-ACHARD, op. cit., p. 29.

3 ibid., p. 30.



Ezek xliii. 1-12): 'The mission of Israel consists in reflecting the glory of God by accepting His gifts and His judgment alike. ... Israel plays the part of intermediary for the nations, sending them back to Him to whom it owes all. It is their light because, first, and in an exceptional fashion, it has been enlightened by the glory of God.'<sup>1</sup> This interpretation ties up with our previous findings. There is little doubt, then, that Jesus had the 'Servant' and his mission in mind, when he said to his disciples: 'You are the light of the world.' Thus by now, i.e. on the Mount of the Sermon during the ministry in Galilee, the disciples were meant to participate in Jesus' own mission as the Son/Servant of God (cf. Baptism).

The explanation of the divine decree Mt v. 14a given in 14b points the way to a similar interpretation to the one suggested by the background of the Servant passages in Deutero-Isaiah. G. VON RAD says, 'the eschatological community of the disciples is the city set on a hill, and her light becomes visible to all the world.'<sup>2</sup> VON RAD bases his view on Is ii. 1-4,<sup>3</sup> Is lx and Hag ii. 6-9. The vital points in these texts for our present question are these: '... the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established as the highest of the mountains ...' (Is ii. 2b);

Arise, shine; for your light ( 'orek// τὸ φῶς ) has come,  
and the glory (khe<sup>e</sup> bhodh// δόξα ) of the Lord has risen upon you.

And nations shall come to your light,  
and kings to the brightness of your rising. (Is lx. 1, 3)

'... and I will fill this house with splendor (kabhodh// δόξα ης ), says the Lord of hosts' (Hag ii. 7b). It is evident that the 'light' in the second passage is identical with the glory of Yahweh, and that the reference is to the cultic theophany in the Temple of Jerusalem. 'This town', VON RAD says, 'must arise in order to face her transfiguration, which occurs with the coming of Yahweh. Then a contrast also in cosmic dimension will be revealed: Above the nations lies thick darkness, but above Jerusalem the light-glory of Yahweh has arisen.'<sup>4</sup>

---

1 R. MARTIN-ACHARD, op. cit., p. 31.

2 G. VON RAD, Studien AT, p. 224.

3 See above p. 65f.

4 *ibid.*, p. 218.

In Mt v.15 the metaphor is more popular, for the light of the disciples is compared to the light of a lamp. T. W. MANSON observed, 'There is a small but significant point of difference between Lk.11.33 and Mt. 5.15. In Lk. the light is placed on a lamp-stand "that they which enter in may see the light": in Mt. to give light to those who are in the house. The latter contemplates a reformation within Judaism, the former conversions from outside.'<sup>1</sup> In fact, the two different emphases do not exclude each other. In the context of the Sermon, which belongs to the first stage of Jesus' ministry, Matthew's version, which envisages the restoration of Israel through the glorious presence of God in her midst, is more likely to be authentic. In this connection, we may recall the illumination of the Temple that was a feature of the Feast of Tabernacles. As A. EDERSHEIM has pointed out, it 'must have been intended as a symbol not only of the Shechinah which once filled the Temple, but of that "great light" which "the people that walked in darkness" were to see ...'.<sup>2</sup>

Mt v.16 confirms that the light of the disciples originates from God: those who see it must 'give glory (δοξαζουσιν)' to their, i.e. the disciples', Father who is in heaven. The expression 'your Father' points to the fulfilment of the promise v.9b: the evidence for the divine sonship is the presence and communion of the Father. The imperative, 'Let your light shine ...', is based on the divine decree: 'You are the light...', which in turn presupposes the theophany. Obviously, Jesus is not afraid of relating the divine light to the 'good works' of the disciples. This points to the ethical issue of the presence of God in the eschatological community: Since the disciples were initiated into the kingdom of heaven, or adopted as God's sons, they were committed to live in a son's way, or, in other words, in the way of perfection.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 T. W. MANSON, Sayings, p. 93.

2 See above p.127.

3 Cf. A. M. HUNTER, Design, p. 103: 'We said a moment ago that the apostolic Gospel involved ethical consequences. Let us put it this way. Since the Kingdom (or Reign) of God had come in Christ, then obviously believers in him were committed to live in "a Kingdom way". Or, as St. John would have put it, the "Gospel" implied also the "Commandment".'

## VIII

### THE WAY OF PERFECTION

#### 1 The cultic significance of the 'I' of the Antitheses

We have already suggested above that the passage Mt v.17-20 most probably was no part of the original Sermon on the Mount.<sup>1</sup> 'The plain purpose of this preamble', T.W.MANSON says about this passage, 'is to prevent misunderstanding of the provisions which follow. There was no point on which devout Palestinian Jews were more sensitive than on any attempt to tamper with the Law, which was for them something directly given by God Himself, and therefore perfect and irreformable. Conservative Palestinian Christians were not only themselves sympathetic towards this high doctrine of the Law, but also under the necessity of defining the Jewish-Christian attitude to their national heritage.'<sup>2</sup>

MANSON's view to a certain extent is in line with R.BULTMANN's contention that 'Matt. 5.17-19 derives from the discussions between the more conservative (Palestinian) communities and those that were free from the law (Hellenistic).'<sup>3</sup> However, MANSON seems to ascribe the passage to M, whereas BULTMANN says, 'Luke has used but a fragment of this section, whose tone was not to his liking. Matthew took it from Q.'<sup>4</sup> H.BRAUN proposes a third possibility, namely 'that Mt v.17-19 stems from the structure of sectarian thought.'<sup>5</sup>

---

1 See above p.44/45.

2 T.W.MANSON, Sayings, p.153; about vs.17 MANSON says, 'There is no reason why Jesus should not have uttered this saying', whereas the affirmation vs.18 'by Jesus is hardly thinkable' (ibid., p.153/54). Cf. also ibid., p.25, where MANSON says about vs.19: 'It may well be thought that we have here a reflection of the disputes which arose out of the Gentile mission (Acts 15) and of the deep suspicion with which Paul was regarded by the more extreme Jewish Christians (Acts 21.15-25). These two verses (Mt. 5.18f.) will then point to a time after A.D. 50 as the time for the compilation of M, and probably nearer 60 than 50.'

3 R.BULTMANN, Tradition, p.138.

4 ibid., p.138.

5 H.BRAUN, Radikalismus II, p.11, cf.n.2.



The redaction critics G. STRECKER<sup>1</sup> and R. HUMMEL<sup>2</sup> hold that both Mt v.17 and 20 are products of the redaction. Mt v.20, 'For I tell you, unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven', is Matthew's own introduction to the Antitheses.<sup>3</sup> The fact that it makes a contrast not with the 'men of old' (Mt v.21ff.) but with 'the scribes and Pharisees' clearly shows its secondary character. According to R. HUMMEL, Matthew's point is this: 'Without torah there is no righteousness whatever, much less a better one than that of the scribes and Pharisees.'<sup>4</sup>

With HUMMEL's statement we may compare W.D. DAVIES' conclusion about Matthew's intention in the Sermon on the Mount: 'We cannot doubt that Matthew intended it to represent the Messianic Torah. By this he meant not a new, that is, a different, Law, but a new interpretation of the Old Law.'<sup>5</sup> ... Our treatment thus ends in an ambiguity. Matthew presents Jesus as giving a Messianic Law on the Mount, but he avoids the express concept of a New Torah and a New Sinai: he has cast around his Lord the mantle of a teacher of righteousness, but he avoids the express ascription to him of the honorific "a New Moses".<sup>6</sup>

What was Jesus' own view in this matter? 'We shall than hold', DAVIES says, 'that the Law and the Prophets remained valid for Jesus as the expression of the will of God. At this point, he was at one with Sadducee, Pharisee and sectarian. Not his estimate of the Law as the revelation of the will of God set him apart from these but his interpretation of this revelation. In this sense there is a real continuity between his ethical teaching and that of the Law.'<sup>7</sup>

The answer to the question as to how Jesus himself regarded the law and what he intended by the Antitheses, of course depends on the literary problem: Is the present form of the Antitheses authentic or not?<sup>8</sup> BULTMANN's view is that 'the older formulations 5.21f., 27f., 33-37 have given rise to analogous

1 See op.cit., p.144 (v.17) and p.151/52 (v.20).

2 See op.cit., p.66.

3 So already R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p.135; cf. also H. BRAUN, *Radikalismus II*, p.10, n.1; R. HUMMEL, op.cit., p.66; G. STRECKER, op.cit. p.152.

4 R. HUMMEL, op.cit., p.69.

5 W.D. DAVIES, *Setting*, p.107.

6 *ibid.*, p.108; is the observed ambiguity not a clear indication that Matthew is not the 'author' of the Sermon but merely its editor who reinterpreted it in terms of 'righteousness' and 'Law' (cf. Mt v.6, 10, 17-20; vi.1, 33; vii.12)? (Cf. *ibid.*, p.13)

7 *ibid.*, p.428/29.

8 DAVIES, *ibid.*, p.301 and 431, n.1, holds them 'in our form' to be 'secondary'.

formulations, in which unattached dominical sayings have found a home. The motive for the formulation is clear: the antithetical form commends itself by its catechetical character.<sup>1</sup> The fact that the parallels in Luke, namely Lk xvi.18 (cf. Mk x.11f.), Lk vi.27-35, do not have an antithetical form proves nothing against the authenticity of the six Antitheses reported in Matthew, for this most probably is to be put down to Luke's editorial activity.<sup>2</sup> As to the 'parable form and breadth of execution'<sup>3</sup> of some of the Antitheses, this is not surprising when we recall Jesus' method of teaching.<sup>4</sup> The first compiler easily may have added an authentic explanation where it was needed. On the other hand, this does not exclude the possibility of secondary interpolations.

On the whole, then, BULTMANN's arguments against the authenticity of the antithetical form of Mt v.31, 32a, 38, 39a, 43 and 44a are not very convincing.<sup>5</sup> Our view is this: if the first compiler had really wanted to add 'unattached dominical sayings' to the original number of the Antitheses, thereby putting an antithetical form on them, it is reasonable to expect that the total number would have a special significance. But this obviously is not the case - in contrast to the group of ten Beatitudes.<sup>6</sup>

Our contention that the sixfold form of the Antitheses may be authentic is supported by our observations about the 'place in life' of the law, namely the context of the renewal of the covenant.<sup>7</sup> As we have seen above,<sup>8</sup> in this context we find either a general reference to the 'ways' of Yahweh, or a list of Yahweh's (ten) basic commandments. Although there is no clear evidence available, there are reasons to believe that the Decalogue was used in the temple cult,<sup>9</sup> perhaps even at the time of

---

1 R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p.136; for the arguments see *ibid.*, p.134/35.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p.135.

3 *ibid.*, p.135.

4 See above p.274.

5 Cf. T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p.24: 'The conclusion of the whole matter is that the original kernel of the passage 5.21-48 was a series of six brief antithetical statements comprising verses 21-22a, 27-28, 31-32, 33-34a, 38-39a, 43-44a.'

6 Cf. W. D. DAVIES, *Setting*, p.301/02.

7 See above pp.161ff.

8 Cf. p.166.

9 See above p.165/66.



Jesus.<sup>1</sup> If Jesus had the imparting of torah in the context of the renewal of the covenant in mind, it is reasonable to think that the six Antitheses are authentic, for three Antitheses are neither a summary expression (ways of Yahweh) nor a real list of basic commandments.

As to the content of the Antitheses, we note that we have to do here - as in the covenant law, e.g. in the Decalogue<sup>2</sup> - with basic negations in all cases except the last one. A.M.HUNTER has set them down in a clear way: "The old Law said, "No murder". I say, "No anger". The old Law said, "No adultery". I say, "No lustful thought". The old Law said, "Divorce on condition ..." I say, "No Divorce". The old Law said, "No falso swearing". I say, "No swearing at all". The old Law said, "Eye for eye". I say, "No retaliation at all". The old Law said, "Love your neighbour". I say, "Love your enemy".<sup>3</sup> Thus, at first glance, the Antitheses are 'signposts on the margins of a wide sphere of life to which he who belongs to Yahweh has to give heed.'<sup>4</sup> However - as we shall show in our next section - the last Antithesis points to Jesus' tendency evident also in the previous five Antitheses as a whole, namely: to re-formulate basic negations or prohibitions into positive instructions or directions. Thus he continues a tendency which left its traces already in the present form of the Decalogue Ex xx.2ff. par., namely in the two positive formulations concerning the parents and the sabbath.<sup>5</sup>

However that may be with the original number of the Antitheses, it is a fact that some of them are authentic.<sup>6</sup> We must ask, therefore: What is the significance of the 'I' of the Antitheses? As far as we can see, BULTMANN does not pay any attention to this problem in his section about the 'I' - Sayings.<sup>7</sup>

---

1 Cf. W.D.DAVIES, Setting, p.281; (cit. TB Berakoth 12a). The Decalogue may have been used in the Synagogue already before the destruction of the Temple. However, it is obvious that its use 'outside the Temple' became really acute after that event.

2 See above pp.167 (cit. GUTBROD) and 168/69 (cit. VON RAD).

3 A.M.HUNTER, Design, p.44/45.

4 G.VON RAD, Theology I, p.194; (cf. above p.169).

5 Cf. above p.168, n.3.

6 Cf. BULTMANN's criterion, Tradition, p.135: '... in these passages the antithesis was plainly never an isolated saying, for it is only intelligible in relation to the thesis...'

7 Cf. *ibid.*, pp.150ff.



His opinion about the instances discussed by him is this: 'Confidence in the antiquity of the "I-sayings" is in the last resort considerably lessened by observing how such sayings multiply more and more in later tradition. ... The "I-sayings" were predominantly the work of the Hellenistic Churches, though a beginning had already been made in the Palestinian Church. Here too Christian prophets filled by the Spirit spoke in the name of the ascended Lord sayings like Rev. 16.15.'<sup>1</sup>

Over against this, we believe that the expression 'But I say to you' in the Antitheses almost certainly is not the work of the early Church but a formulation used by Jesus on the Mount of the Sermon. 'In the first place', DAVIES rightly says, 'the words under which the disciple stands are most emphatically presented as the words of Jesus himself: the commandments of the Sermon are his to be obeyed (this is the least that can be said of the phrase "But I say unto you" in the antitheses), and it is as his words that they constitute the standard of judgment on the Last Day (vii.24, where the "mine" is emphatic:  $\pi \alpha \varsigma \circ \theta \iota \nu \delta \sigma \tau \iota \varsigma \lambda \acute{\alpha} \kappa \nu \epsilon \iota \mu \omicron \upsilon \tau \circ \upsilon \varsigma \lambda \acute{o} \gamma \omicron \upsilon \varsigma \tau \circ \upsilon \tau \omicron \upsilon \varsigma$  : the translation might be: "Every one then who hears me, in respect to these sayings ...").'<sup>2</sup> Thus there can be no doubt about the importance of the 'I' for the understanding of the Antitheses. But again we must ask, What is its significance?<sup>3</sup>

Following again our cultic line of approach, we answer: In accordance with the "place of life" of Yahweh's basic commandments (Decalogue) the 'I' of the Antitheses signifies that Yahweh himself is speaking through his representative (cf. Pss xcv.7b-11; 1.7;<sup>4</sup> Ps l. 16-20; Ps lxxx.1.8-16;<sup>5</sup> Ex xx.2ff.<sup>6</sup>).

E. STAUFFER, in his 'Jesus and His Story', made some interesting observations about the 'I' formulae used by Jesus. We quote here the points that are relevant for the present section: 'At the feast of Tabernacles

1 R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p.163/63.

2 W.D. DAVIES, *Setting*, p.94.

3 Cf. DAVIES' answer, *ibid.*, p.94/95: 'In this sense, the ethical teaching is not detached from the life of him who uttered it, and with whom it is congruous. It is personalized in him. It is not only given through or by means of Jesus but in him, if we may borrow a possible Johannine distinction.' (cf. Jn. i.17)

4 See above p.162.

5 See above p.163/64.

6 See above p.166.

the festal portion of scripture about the giving of the Torah on Sinai was read with the introductory words: "I AM the Lord your God who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. You shall have none other gods before me" (Deut. 5. 6ff.).<sup>1</sup> ... In the large scroll of Isaiah at Qumran the "I" speeches of God are often brought into prominence with much careful thought by the arrangement into paragraphs. This suggests that these speeches of manifestation, stressing the "I", were used at some theophanic feasts - perhaps at the feast of Tabernacles away from the temple in the wilderness. In Jerusalem itself on the sabbath of the Tabernacles week the Levites sang the song of Moses, which in Deut. 23.39f. contains an abundance of Deutero-Isaianic "I" formulae. This theophanic formula ANI HU from Isa. 40ff. had now won a secure place for itself beside the older ones from Psalms 46, 50 and 81. That must have happened before the birth of Christ. This is proved by a saying of Hillel the Elder which is often misinterpreted. He taught in Jerusalem under Herod the Great, and it was said of him: "When Hillel the Elder was gay at the distribution of the waters (a rite at the feast of Tabernacles), he used to say: 'When ANI is here, then all is here. When ANI is not here, then who is here?'" The saying is a riddle, a "mashal", which Hillel wished to contribute for the entertainment of the pilgrims to the temple - the duty of every scribe at the feast of Tabernacles. This saying of Hillel can be translated as we have just done. In that case it refers to the marvel of God's manifestation at this feast - to the presence of the divine ANI in the temple.<sup>2</sup> After a sketch of the 'state of development reached in the early days of Jesus (c.A.D.20)', STAUFFER concludes, 'The accounts in the Gospels of his "I" sayings must be understood in this light.'<sup>3</sup>

STAUFFER does not mention the 'I' of the Antitheses in his discussion. Basing his investigation mainly on the Fourth Gospel, he arrives at the following conclusion: 'Nor can there be any longer any doubt about the meaning of Jesus' ANI HU, if we judge by the linguistic form, history and context of this "I" formula. Jesus uses these words with the meaning of the theophanic formula in the Old Testament and in the liturgy. He intends to state that in his life the manifestation of God in history is taking place. ...

---

1 E. STAUFFER, *Jesus*, p.142.

2 *ibid.*, p.146.

3 *ibid.*, p.149.



It is Jesus' boldest declaration about himself. "I AM".<sup>1</sup> This means: where I am, there is God, there God lives, speaks, calls, asks, acts, decides, loves, chooses, forgives, rejects, hardens, suffers, dies. Nothing bolder can be said, or imagined.<sup>2</sup>

It is not in the line of the present study to discuss the instances where Jesus uses a theophanic formula according to STAUFFER. We are concerned here only with the instances that this author rejects without giving any reasons, namely: the 'I' formulae of the Antitheses. It is in keeping with the cultic interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount to regard them as theophanic formulae. This implies that Jesus on the Mount in Galilee speaks in a way similar to that of the cult prophets or Levites,<sup>3</sup> in the Temple on Mount Zion. In other words: Jesus speaks as God's representative, as God 'in Person'<sup>4</sup> (or, as we shall see later, as His Son). We believe that Jesus thereby proleptically fulfilled the eschatological hope expressed in Is ii.3b:

... that HE may teach us HIS ways

and that we may walk in HIS paths.

For out of Zion shall go forth the law

and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.<sup>5</sup>

1 Cf. the n. attached here, *ibid.*, p.192, n.101: 'The most characteristic expression of this claim to recognition is Jesus' announcement-formula,  $\alpha\mu\eta\iota\nu\ \lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \delta\mu\iota\nu$ , which takes the place of God's oath in the Old Testament. Cf. Ezek. 14.16ff. and Origen on Ezek.14.20 (Lommatzsch 14, p.216f.). Besides this it should be noticed how the Palestinian Syriac translates the formula  $\alpha\mu\eta\iota\nu\ \lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \delta\mu\iota\nu$ : "amen amer ana lachun" (similarly Delitzsch). According to this, in Jesus' mother-tongue a personal pronoun appears here which is omitted when reproduced in Greek. Therefore the emphatic ANA was on Jesus' lips more frequently than has been assumed hitherto from the wording of the Greek gospels (Matt. 5. 21ff. is hardly Jesus' own wording).'

2 E. STAUFFER, *ibid.*, p.159; STAUFFER's conclusions in the paragraph following on our cit. are not supported by the evidence even of John's Gospel, esp. when he says, 'God himself becomes a human being ...'. Cf. Jn i.14: 'And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; we have beheld his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father.' This is to say, Jesus is not in the literal sense 'God himself', i.e., the Father, but 'the Word' and 'the Son'. We shall return to this point below in section three of the present chapter.

3 Cf. above p.252; (cit. MARTIN-ACHARD).

4 Cf. W.D.DAVIES, *Setting*, p.97, who defines Matthew's view as follows: 'Jesus commands as Lord; Moses commanded as Mediator.' (cf. Mt iii.3)

5 Cf. above pp.65/66, 251/62.



In view of Mt v.14 and 16, 'You are the light of the world ... Let your light shine before men', Is ii.5 is significant:

O house of Jacob, come,

let us walk in the light of the Lord.

In this connection, the following passage by W.D.DAVIES deserves quotation: 'That Jesus called men to radical decision as Bultmann has insisted is true. But the bare category of "decision" does not do justice to the content of the teaching of Jesus, which calls not only for a decision in vacuo, but to a way of life illumined by his words. So too the claim that, given the courage to decide for the Rule of God, sufficient insight into the right conduct to be followed in any given situation is furnished by that situation itself, ignores the revelatory force of the words of the Messiah. ... Similarly any attempt to understand the words of Jesus merely as a hammer, to use Luther's phrase, to reduce us to despair and thus prepare us for the Gospel is alien to the purpose of Jesus - his words are a light for our way, they are the Law of the Messiah to guide.'<sup>1</sup>

In accordance with our cultic understanding of the Sermon on the Mount, we may say: Jesus' use of the theophanic formula 'But "I" say unto you' implies that the Antitheses are the directions of the heavenly Father to guide the eschatological community in His way.<sup>2</sup> Thus the Antitheses tie up with the previous context of the authentic Sermon, namely Mt v.16:

Let your light shine before men,

that they may see your good works

and give glory to your Father who is in heaven.

This is to say, the Antitheses point out how in practice the disciples are to glorify their Father in the heavens.

This interpretation of the 'I' of the Antitheses may throw new light on the antithetic formula as a whole, 'You have heard that it was said to the men of old ... But "I" say to you ...' H.K.McARTHUR defines the problem involved in this formula - and in Mt v.17 - as follows: 'The Sermon and the Mosaic

---

<sup>1</sup> W.D.DAVIES, Setting, p.434/35.

<sup>2</sup> As it is the Father who guides his people through his Anointed (i.e. 'the Son of the living God', Mt xvi.16), his demand implies not 'terror' but 'grace'. Cf. DAVIES, *ibid.*, p.435, who says about the whole Sermon, 'And as the King-Messiah, the Covenant Mediator of the End, Jesus also issued his demand. And despite the pattern that Matthew for his own purposes gave to it, this demand in its grace and terror still confronts us in the SM.'

Tradition'.<sup>1</sup> 'Broadly speaking,' McARTHUR, says later in his discussion, 'modern scholars fall into two groups: those who maintain, with the Reformers, that Jesus re-established the original intent of the Old Law, and those who affirm that he went beyond it. The latter group usually assume that this development involved the abrogation of parts of the earlier tradition.'<sup>2</sup> We ask, Is this the true alternative, or was Jesus' emphasis as evident from the antithetical formula different?

It has been suggested that the antithetical formula used by Jesus may be understood against the background of the dialectic exposition of the Law by the Rabbis, according to which the first part of the Antithesis means, 'You have understood literally what was said.'<sup>3</sup> Over against this, GEORGE A.F. KNIGHT is right in saying, 'On the other hand, the translation "Ye have heard" is not technical enough to be in accord with the Jewish usage of the period.'<sup>4</sup> KNIGHT proposes, 'I think we might also explain Jesus' phrase "You have heard ..." by expanding it to mean: "You have heard in the reading of the scripture in the synagogue services ...'<sup>5</sup> This interpretation is too narrow.<sup>6</sup> W. MICHAELIS suggests that the point is rather: you know. 'Known', he goes on to say, 'is not only the commandment itself but also that it was said to the men of old.'<sup>7</sup> Who said it?

BULTMANN holds, 'The Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5.21-48) contrasts the Law and the will of God: "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time ... But I say unto you ...". God does not claim man only in so far as his behaviour is covered by formulated precepts, as though outside that area man were free. ... God demands the complete surrender of man's will, and knows no concessions: (cf. Lk vi. 43f. and Mt vii. 16, 18; Mt vi. 22f.).'<sup>8</sup> However, there is little doubt that Jesus himself would

---

1 H. K. McARTHUR, Understanding, pp. 26ff.

2 *ibid.* p. 41.

3 Cf. esp. DAVID DAUBE, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London 1956, pp. 55ff.

4 G. A. F. KNIGHT, Law and Grace, Must a Christian Keep the Law of Moses? London 1962, p. 66.

5 *ibid.*, p. 67.

6 So also W. MICHAELIS, Mt I, p. 253/54.

7 *ibid.*, p. 254.

8 R. BULTMANN, Christianity, p. 72/73.



have answered the question, Who said it? - by: God, of course.<sup>1</sup> It is probable that the passive tense (ἐπεειπεν, aor. pass.) points the way to this interpretation.<sup>2</sup> Thus we may paraphrase with MICHAELIS, 'God let Moses say, but myself he lets say.'<sup>3</sup> In this case, there is no question of a 'new' law but rather - as DAVIES has said - of 'a new interpretation of the Old Law.' This is also KNIGHT's view: 'All that "Moses" had to say, he believed, came to its final "end" in what he had to say, as he taught men by showing the continuity between Moses and himself in the words "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time ... but I say unto you ...".'<sup>4</sup> To a certain extent this is correct. However, we may not lose sight of the contrast implied in the 'but' (δέ) altogether.

In accordance with our contention that the Father is speaking through his representative, we suggest: the contrast lies in the first place in the person of the representative. As we shall discuss this point in the third section of the present chapter, we may quote provisionally Heb i.1,2. where - we believe - a similar contrast is implied: 'In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets - but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son, ...' Thus the switch from the passive, referring to God's speaking through Moses, or priests, or cult prophets, or prophets, to the active emphasizes the superior quality of God's way of speaking on the Mount of the Sermon, or in other words, to the unique relation of the speaker with God: 'But "I", i.e. the Father through the Son, say to you ...'<sup>5</sup> In the second place - for this point depends on the first - the contrast lies also in the content of the torah imparted by the Son. It will be discussed in our following section.

1 Cf above p.307; (cit. DAVIES, Setting, p.428/29).

2 So also W.MICHAELIS, Mt I, p.254.

3 *ibid.*, p.259.

4 G.A.F.KNIGHT, *op.cit.*, p.77.

5 Cf. W.D.DAVIES, *ibid.*, p.135: 'Be this as it may the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah will bring his Torah. Östborn would see in this Torah of the Servant a mark of his kingship. But he seems to do violence to the evidence when he makes the king in Israel too much the imparter of Torah. The passages he quotes as well as those indicated by us on the pages above show that the king was expected to maintain Torah, but not necessarily that he mediated Torah.' (cf. *ibid.*, n.5) - We regard both 'Son' and 'Servant' as a royal cultic title (cf. above p.202f.). At any rate, as Jesus seems to have combined the two titles by applying both to himself, there is no difficulty in thinking that Jesus, who knew himself to be the royal Son, i.e., the King-Messiah, imparted torah on the Mount of the Sermon.



We already have mentioned above that the Antitheses may be understood against the background of the cultic renewal of the covenant.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, we may describe the event on the Mount of the Sermon as the eschatological renewal of the covenant, and compare it with the well-known prophecy Jer xxxi.31-34.<sup>2</sup> Now, if we take Jeremiah's prophecy of the New Covenant together with the prophecy Is ii.2-5, we are able to recognise in what sense God himself takes the direction of the eschatological community in hand: Every single member of this community, 'from the least of them to the greatest', knows the Lord, i.e. lives in communion with Him like sons and daughters with their Father.<sup>3</sup> At last the glorious hope of the great prophets is going to be fulfilled: Yahweh is coming (again?)<sup>4</sup> to dwell among His people and to teach them His ways. It is not improbable that Jesus meant the 'I' of the Antitheses to be understood also as a fulfilment of the 'theophanic I' of Jer xxxi.33b: 'I will put my law within them, and I will write it upon their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.'

Hence we may conclude that the basic structure of the Sermon on the Mount indeed reflects the basic structure of the temple cult:<sup>5</sup> Whereas the function of the Beatitudes is the initiation of the disciples into the presence and communion with God, the heavenly Father, the Antitheses are meant to be exhortations addressed to the disciples to continue in the communion with God. The cultic significance of the 'I' of the Antitheses is that the heavenly Father now speaks in a new way: not through a prophet or priest but through the Son.

<sup>1</sup> See above p.303.

<sup>2</sup> We have suggested above (p.139) that Jer vii.2ff. may recall the proclamation of the 'torah of entrance'. We believe that Jer xxxi.31f. recalls another part of the temple cult, namely the imparting of torah in the context of the renewal of the covenant, as Is ii.2-5.

<sup>3</sup> In Mt x.42 the expression *ἐν τῶν μικρῶν τούτων* stands in one line with 'prophet' and 'righteous man', and obviously denotes the disciples. Since the LXX reads in Jer xxxviii.34 *ἀπὸ τοῦ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου αὐτοῦ* (cf. Heb viii.11; Hebrew: Jer xxxi.34= *l' miqtannim w' ad-g' dolam*), may we assume that Jesus by this expression refers to the prophecy of the New Covenant? In this case, the disciples are 'these little ones' who 'know the Lord'. Cf. below p.363.

<sup>4</sup> Ex xxix.43-46 suggests that Yahweh's 'coming' in the 'tent of meeting' already to a certain extent intended the same, namely '... And I will dwell among the people of Israel, and will be their God. And they shall know that I am the Lord their God ...' (Cf. G.A.F. KNIGHT, op.cit., p.59).

<sup>5</sup> See above p.175.

## 2 The cultic interpretation of the Antitheses

In the previous section we have found that the antithetical formulations in Mt v.21-48 imply both continuity and contrast: continuity in that both the 'old' law (= thesis) and the 'new' law (=antithesis)<sup>1</sup> express the will of God; contrast in that the heavenly Father now speaks through the Son in order to guide the eschatological community in His way. In the present section we shall try to understand the divine direction of the New (i.e. 'renewed'<sup>2</sup>) Covenant over against those of the Old Covenant, and that in accordance with the cultic character of the former, as they are part of the authentic Sermon on the Mount.

### (1) The first Antithesis (Mt v.21-26; cf. Lk xii.57-59)

The saying on agreeing with your accuser in verses 25 and 26, which appears also in Luke xii. 57-59 and thus belongs to the old tradition, probably was added here by the final editor of Matthew.<sup>3</sup> There is no need to discuss it here, because the person mentioned in it, i.e. 'your accuser', is not the same as in the original antithesis, namely 'his brother'.

The reference of the first thesis, 'You shall not kill; and whoever kills shall be liable to judgment', is to the sixth commandment of the Decalogue (Ex xx.13); Dt v.17; cf. Dt xvi.18). 'The following clause: "and whosoever ... judgment", ' T. W. MANSON says, 'is likewise based on the written Law. Cf. Exod. 21.12; Lev. 24.17; Dt. 17.8-13.'<sup>4</sup> No comment is needed to understand this thesis.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 We use the term Antithesis(es) - with a capital letter - for the antithetical statement(s) as a whole, whilst the terms 'thesis(es)' and 'antithesis(es)' are meant to indicate its (their) two parts.

2 Cf. G. A. F. Knight, op. cit., pp. 56/57.

3 So also T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 155; A. M. HUNTER, *Design*, p. 46; W. L. KNOX, *Sources II* (cf. above p.40), p.21; J. DUPONT, *Béatitudes* (cf. above p.8), p. 147.

4 T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 155.

5 Cf. *ibid.*, p.155: 'All that is given in v.21 is thus a concise and simple statement of the law concerning murder, as it stands in the Old Testament.'



The first antithesis, of course, does not abrogate the foregoing thesis but reinterprets it in the light of the New Covenant. Whereas the previous context, especially the Beatitudes, was concerned with the renewal of the 'vertical' relationship, the Antitheses are concerned with the renewal of the 'horizontal' relationship. Or, in other words, with 'ethics'. It is important to recognise at the outset that the sequence of the Antitheses is from the 'brother' (ἀδελφός, v.22) to the 'enemy' (ἐχθρός, v.44). This is to say, from 'those who are near' to 'those who are far off' (cf. Eph ii.17). There is little doubt, then, that 'your brother' (v.23f.), or, 'his brother' (22), refers to the fellow-member of the eschatological community.<sup>1</sup>

A. M. HUNTER describes the abuse-words in v.22b as 'very puzzling' and holds - with T. W. MANSON<sup>2</sup> - that 'judgment' (22b) 'is really the end of the antithesis.'<sup>3</sup> However, MANFRED WEISE recently advanced the hypothesis that Mt v.21f. reflects a rite common at Qumran, viz. the Levitical Curse, and his findings throw new light on the two abuse-words mentioned in this passage.<sup>4</sup> The evidence for their proper understanding actually stems not from the Scrolls but from the Syrian Didascalia: 'There it is said that he who uses these words offends Christ, or the Holy Spirit who dwells in the brother (im Nächsten). In other words: ῥακί, or μωρε, are no terms of abuse in a banal sense but they deny the communion, or the relationship, of the person offended with God. Herein lies their seriousness, which makes him who utters them unquestioningly liable to the judgment of God.'<sup>5</sup>

It is quite probable that this interpretation, especially as formulated in the second part of WEISE's statement, conveys the authentic meaning of the two abuse-words. This would be in keeping with the cultic interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount, which implies that the relationship with God

- 
- 1 Cf. K. SCHUBERT, *The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts*, in: *Scrolls-NT*, ed. K. STENDAHL, p. 125/26; SCHUBERT quotes 1 QS vi.1: 'Let no man bring something against his brother before the Many if he have not already admonished him before witnesses.' (Cf. also Mt xviii.15ff.)
  - 2 T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 155.
  - 3 A. M. HUNTER, *Design*, p. 46.
  - 4 See M. WEISE, *Mt.5.21f. - ein Zeugnis sakraler Rechtsprechung in der Urgemeinde*, in: *ZNW*, Heft 1-2 1958, pp. 116ff.
  - 5 *ibid.*, p. 123; see also T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 156; however, MANSON finally says, 'It may be doubted whether v.22b is a genuine saying of Jesus.'



and his dwelling in the midst of his eschatological community is essential for its existence, as well as for that of the 'brother' who is its member. Hence it follows that to deny the *communio cum deo* of a brother is an attack on his very existence, or, in other words, it means 'to kill'.<sup>1</sup>

It may be argued, then, that v.22a is not intelligible without the explanation in v.22b.<sup>2</sup> In this case, the whole verse must be regarded as a unity which contains three parallel members, marked here a-b-c:

- But I say to you that every one
- (a) who is angry with his brother  
shall be liable to judgment;
  - (b) whoever calls his brother 'raca',  
shall be liable to the council,
  - (c) and whoever says, 'more!'  
shall be liable to the hell of fire.<sup>3</sup>

Taken as a whole, the point made in this passage is not unlike that in Mt vii. 1-5: Judgment of 'your brother', i.e. again of the fellow-member of the eschatological community. In that passage, the emphasis is more on the offence given by the brother ('speck'), which is attempted to be removed, whereas in the present antithesis the reaction to an offence ('angry') is mentioned. The point is essentially the same: 'The whole business of judging persons', T. W. MANSON says about Mt vii.1,2// Lk vi. 37,38, 'is in God's hands, for He alone knows the secrets of men's hearts. This does not mean that we are not to use all the moral insight we possess in order to discover what is right and wrong; but that we are to confine ourselves to that field and refrain from passing judgment on persons. For our

---

1 Cf. D. BONHOEFFER, *Cost.* p. 116: 'Anger is always an attack on the brother's life, for it refuses to let him live and aims at his destruction.'

2 This seems to be confirmed by the fact that some ancient authorities insert 'without cause' after 'is angry with his brother'; however, this most probably is not the original point. Cf. D. BONHOEFFER, *ibid.*, p. 116: 'Jesus will not accept the common distinction between righteous indignation and unjustifiable anger. (n.: The addition  $\epsilon\iota\kappa\eta$  in the majority of MSS. (though not in  $\mathcal{N}$  and B) is the first attempt to mitigate the harshness of this saying.)'

3 A. M. HUNTER's question, 'But why should one abusive word get legal treatment only, the other eschatological?' (*Design*, p. 46), then, is not relevant, because we have to do here with parallelism membrorum.

judgment is itself a factor in shaping their lives, and a harsh judgment may help a fellow-creature on the road to perdition. "Give a dog a bad name - and hang him".<sup>1</sup> This is to say, with respect to Mt v.22, often God alone knows whether or not a member of His eschatological community is in His communion and acts in accordance with His will.

A majority of scholars considers the vss. 23-24 to be a redactional insertion into the first Antithesis.<sup>2</sup> In view of the structure of the following Antitheses,<sup>3</sup> however, there is no reason to doubt that its present place is the original one.<sup>4</sup> For the cultic interpretation of the Sermon, moreover, the direct reference to the Temple cult is extremely interesting.<sup>5</sup> For even if the expression 'offering your gift at the altar' ( *θυσιαστήριον* ) is used here metaphorically and merely denotes an act of worship<sup>6</sup>, it suggests that this expression rings a bell for Jesus and his disciples.

The meaning of the two verses 23,24 is similar to that of the following petition of the Lord's Prayer:

And forgive us our debts,

as we also have forgiven our debtors (Mt vi.12).

This is to say, to 'have forgiven our debtors' for a disciple practically means to have wiped out anger and hatred of his brother which is in him. Judged by itself, the point of the two passages is that reconciliation, or forgiveness to your brother takes precedence of an act of worship.<sup>7</sup> In the context of the Sermon, however, the renewal of the 'vertical' relationship precedes, as a matter of principle, the renewal of the 'horizontal' relationships (cf. the sequence Beatitudes - Antitheses).

---

1 T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 56.

2 See J. DUPONT, *Béatitudes*, p. 148.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 149 and 156.

4 See however T. W. MANSON, *ibid.* p. 156.

5 See above p. 216.

6 Cf. J. DUPONT, *ibid.*, p. 149, n.2 (the difficulty of obeying this commandment from Galilee; see however Mk i.44 par.).

7 For the Jewish rule in this matter see T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 156.

As the positive statement of the first antithesis, the meaning of Mt v.23-24 is clear: Anger at his brother, which leads to spiritual murder, can only be overcome if both parties are immediately ready for forgiveness and reconciliation. The renewal of the relationship with God in worship must always go together with the renewal of the relationship with the brother. In short, the essential meaning of the first Antithesis, stated positively, is: Respect for the fellow-member.

(2) The Second Antithesis (Mt v. 27-30; cf. Mk ix.43-48; Mt xviii.8-9). - The present thesis refers to the seventh commandment of the Decalogue, 'You shall not commit adultery' (Ex xx.14; Dt v.18). T. W. MANSON explains concerning 'Jewish legislation about the offence of adultery': '... the essential point is that in Jewish law adultery is always intercourse between a married woman and a man other than her husband. (In construing the law formal betrothal is regarded as equivalent to marriage.) Hence while a woman can commit adultery against her husband, a man cannot commit adultery against his wife. He can only commit adultery against another married man.'<sup>1</sup>

The second antithesis draws the attention of the eschatological community to the position of the woman (γυναίκα). In order to understand the proper intention of the present reinterpretation of 'adultery', two things must be considered: It is quite probable that there were some women among the disciples on the mountain; a 'single' woman at that time was rather an exception.<sup>2</sup> Hence it follows that Jesus was speaking about 'women' not as cases Jewish legislation was concerned with but as persons and, above all, as fellow-members of the eschatological community, when he proclaimed in the name of God: 'But I say to you that every one who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart.' This is to say, a woman is not an object of man's lust. Whoever treats her as such, even in thought, is an adulterer in God's sight.

---

1 See also DAVID R. MACE, Hebrew Marriage, A sociological Study, London 1953, pp. 226ff, 241ff.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 144: 'Hebrew society therefore planned to secure that all persons of marriageable age should be provided with a partner. Every adult male must be married, and as far as possible every woman also. We have seen that there was no place in Hebrew society for the "single" woman as we know her; and the lot of widows was such that remarriage was to be sought if at all possible.'



According to the present form of the second Antithesis, after the basic antithesis follows a rather harsh saying about 'your right eye' and 'your right hand' as the instruments of lust: 'pluck it out', or, 'cut it off', 'and throw it away' (v. 29-30). The question as to whether or not these two verses are part of the original antithesis is difficult to decide on a purely literary ground. J. DUPONT, on the one hand, points out that the Marcan parallel in Mk ix.43-48 shows the same triadic structure as the examples in the other Antitheses, except the third. However, because of the inversion of the two elements contained in Mt v.29,30 over against Mk ix.43-48 and Mt xviii.8-9, which puts the eye first and thus seems to indicate a secondary adaption to Mt v.28 (ὁ βλέπων), DUPONT holds that the saying is added here by the final redaction of Matthew.<sup>1</sup>

W. L. KNOX, on the other hand, says, 'It would seem that v.29 always belonged to the document containing the original form of the revised Decalogue; if the sayings go back to Jesus himself, this will always have stood here. But the saying became detached from its original context and triplicated for the sake of a round completeness, and so found its way into the collection of sayings which Mark has incorporated at ix. 41ff.'<sup>2</sup>

Whatever may be the authentic form of Mt v.29f., the point made here, we believe, is essential for the second antithesis: Obedience in this matter may imply the removal of the 'skandalon' (i.e. 'snare', cf. σκανδαλίζει) which causes the lustful look. So as anger destroys the right relationship between brother and brother, the lustful look destroys the right relationship between brother and 'sister', i.e. female member of the eschatological community, and thus endangers the new covenant with God.<sup>3</sup> Although a positive statement is lacking in the second Antithesis, its content may finally be formulated positively in order to convey its full intention: *R e s p e c t f o r w o m e n .*

### (3) The Third Antithesis (Mt v.31-32; cf. Mt xix.9; Mk x.11-12; Lk xvi.18). -

W. L. KNOX holds the present section to be inserted here by the final redaction because of the change in

1 See J. DUPONT, *Béatitudes*, pp. 150 and 121-123; cf. also T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 157: 'It may be that Mt. has reversed the order to make a better connexion. But there is no real connexion. What is given in these verses is very strongly worded advice to tame the natural desires and passions at all costs.'

2 W. L. KNOX, *Sources II*, p. 22.

3 Cf. D. BONHOEFFER, *Cost*, p. 119: 'When you have made your eye the instrument of impurity, you cannot see God with it.'

the antithetical formula (ἐπεὶ οὕτως). 'As a piece of literary design', he adds, 'the whole passage 31f., standing as it does after 28ff., is a bad anticlimax.'<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, T. W. MANSON says, 'Here we have an antithesis in something like its original form, without any accretions of teaching from elsewhere.'<sup>2</sup>

Whatever our opinion as to the literary problems posed by the present Antithesis, the parallels outside the Sermon prove the authenticity of its essential content. In our view, moreover, the incorporation of the teaching on divorce into the Antitheses is highly significant. If it is an anticlimax to the previous context as to its content as well, what would have been the proper climax? If we argue from the point of view of the later Christian tendency, the answer is: But I say to you, do not marry at all. However, this would not have been in keeping with the Old Testament view in this matter.<sup>3</sup> Jesus makes it quite clear that marriage belongs to the present manifestation of the kingdom of heaven. According to Mt xxii.30, it will be abolished only 'in the resurrection'.<sup>4</sup>

The third thesis refers to Dt xxiv.1-4, i.e. a law which gives the husband the right to dissolve his marriage by writing his wife 'a bill of divorce'. A comparison with the passage Mk x.6-9 shows that - in contrast to the first and the second thesis - Jesus does not accept the present thesis, i.e. Dt xxiv.1-4, as an expression of the divine will. His argument runs as follows, 'For your hardness of heart he (sc. Moses) wrote you this commandment. But from the beginning of creation, "God made them male

1 W. L. KNOX, *Sources II*, p. 22.

2 T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 157.

3 Cf. D. R. MACE, *op. cit.*, p. 143: 'There is no sign, until the cult of the Essenes, that celibacy was approved or even tolerated. Indeed, according to Strahan it was "at once an impiety and a misfortune" to be unmarried. There was no counterpart amongst the schools of the prophets to the sexual asceticism which later became characteristic of religious orders. "The Old Testament", says Ryder Smith, "has no sanction for celibacy; its priests married, and even its typical ascetic, the Nazarite, was commanded other abstinences than this."'

4 See however Mt. xix.11-12: there are 'those to whom it (sc. the precept about marriage) is not given'. T. W. MANSON *ibid.*, p. 215 suggests that the original point of this passage, which is lost now, is 'the possibility of a clash between the claims of matrimony and the claims of the Kingdom'. In this case, 'Jesus says in effect: Celibacy all round would solve the problem; but celibacy all round is not practicable. The suggestion is well enough for those who can accept it; but there are many who cannot embrace a celibate life - a fact which Paul recognises in 1 Cor. 7. There are, however, those for whom the celibate life is the natural and inevitable thing.' Roman Catholics regard Mt xix.10-12 as an 'invitation to virginity'. The original character of this passage, we believe, is rather that of a dispensation, matrimony being the divine ordinance.



and female." "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one." So they are no longer two but one. What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder' (Mk x. 5-9).<sup>1</sup>

If we proceed from this understanding of marriage to the third antithesis, it is quite certain that the excepting clause is a redactional interpolation.<sup>2</sup> The authentic antithesis, then, was this: 'But I say to you that every one who divorces his wife makes her an adulteress; and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.' However, we must add here at once two considerations: (a) This divine precept is addressed to the eschatological community; (b) it presupposes that the couple in question had married in obedience to the divine ordinance (cf. Gen. i. 27, ii. 24; Mk x. 6-8).

In Jer ii. 1-3 and Hos ii. 16f. the bond of marriage is compared with the covenant between Yahweh and his people. If the third Antithesis is authentic, its special significance is that it places marriage in the context of the eschatological renewal of the covenant, which in Hos ii. 19-20 is described in the following words: 'And I will betroth you to me for ever; I will betroth you to me in righteousness and in justice, in steadfast love, and in mercy. I will betroth you to me in faithfulness; and you shall know the Lord' (cf. Jer xxxi. 31-34).<sup>3</sup>

Keeping in mind the Old Testament background and the wider context of the Sermon, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the third antithesis is meant to reflect God's own faithfulness to his eschatological community. Essentially, then, it is not merely a prohibition but a direction which guides the disciples to true monogamy.<sup>4</sup> In 1 Tim this point appears among the qualifications of a bishop and a deacon: they must be 'the husband of one wife' (*μίας γυναίκας ἄνδρα*, iii. 2, 12). The negative formulation in Mt v. 32f. implies that in the time of Jesus the practice of divorce was the main danger for the divine ideal of monogamy, i.e. that 'the two shall become one'.

1 For the contemporary background cf. D. R. MACE, *op. cit.* p. 256: 'By the time of Jesus it appears certain that divorce had become very widespread in Israel.'

2 So also T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 157.

3 It goes without saying that the marriage relationship implied here is monogamy (cf. D. R. MACE, *ibid.*, p. 137). On the marriage figure in the NT see A. RICHARDSON, *Theology* (cf. above p. 9) pp. 256f: 'The Bride of Christ'.

4 Cf. D. R. MACE, *ibid.*, p. 137: 'So we may sum up by saying that, throughout the period of Hebrew history concerning which knowledge comes to us from the Old Testament, we find the ideal to be always that of monogamy.'



(4) The Fourth Antithesis (Mt v.33-37) - T. W. MANSON points to the difficulty 'that v.33, as it stands, has to do with vows, while vv. 34-37 have to do with oaths'.<sup>1</sup> We follow his second suggestion, '(b) The antithesis is not concerned with vows at all, but with speaking the truth', and reject the clause 'but shall perform to the Lord what you have sworn' (33b).<sup>2</sup>

The fourth thesis, then, which uses the proper opening formula,<sup>3</sup> refers to the third commandment of the Decalogue (cf. Ex xx.7; Dt v.11), but restates it on the lines of Lev xix.12: 'Again you have heard that it was said to the men of old, "You shall not swear falsely". ' As the 'name' of God, i.e. God himself, is invoked as witness by the Israelite who swears, perjury is a profanation of His name. This, of course, is prohibited: 'I am the Lord' (Lev xix.12).

This time, the antithesis is a real one, 'But I say to you, Do not swear at all ... '. Did God change his mind? No, but the situation has changed: God dwells now in the midst of his eschatological community. He is, for the disciples, 'your Father who sees (and hears) in secret' (Mt vi.4,6,18). It is no longer necessary to invoke His 'name' as witness, for He Himself is present.<sup>4</sup> Consequently, the positive statement reads, 'Let what you say be simply "Yes" or "No"; anything more than this comes from evil' (v.37).<sup>5</sup> Whereas the Rabbis never entirely prohibited the taking of

---

1 T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 158.

2 *ibid.*, cf. his explanation which is in keeping with the cultic understanding of the Sermon: 'This second alternative is to be preferred for the following reasons: (i) All the other antitheses are concerned with my duty to my neighbour. It is therefore probable that this one will be concerned with the social duty of truthfulness, rather than with vows, which are a concern between God and man. (ii) The second interpretation enables us to take the principal verbs in their most natural and obvious sense. (iii) It has the support of James 5.12'.

3 Note, however, the addition of the word 'again' (  $\pi \alpha \lambda \iota \nu$  ). J. DUPONT, *Béatitudes*, p. 147, holds that it indicates that the redactor returns to his proper source, after inserting the third Antithesis.

4 A similar point is made by D. BONHOEFFER, *Cost*, p. 123, and A. M. HUNTER, *Design*, p. 51f.; however, these two authors seem to suggest that God's presence is taken for granted and not the results of the new covenant.

5 T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 159 points out that the Greek expression in Jas v.12 is correct, whereas Mt's form is a mistranslation from the Aramaic. This is certainly right, if 'in Jewish teaching the doubled yes or no is regarded as a form of oath', for this would contradict the antithesis. The RSV quoted above gives the corrected and thus authentic meaning: 'let your yes be yes and your no be no' (Jas v.12).

oaths<sup>1</sup>, this was the case at Qumran.<sup>2</sup>

As to the verses 34b-35 (cf. Is lxvi.1;  $\gamma$  xlvii.3), the point is that all of these oaths refer to God. Of special interest is the designation of Jerusalem as 'the city of the great King', i.e. God. We may take this to be a stereotyped expression, which is no evidence against the statement that Jesus never explicitly uses the word 'King' as a divine epithet in the Sermon on the Mount.<sup>3</sup>

Verse 36<sup>4</sup> perhaps refers to a custom which is still current among Muslims in Indonesia, namely to swear by your own life or death.<sup>5</sup> If this is correct, the saying is an argument from the great to the small: How absurd to swear by your 'head', i.e. life, whilst you do not even have power over the colour of your hair.<sup>6</sup>

We now may consider a final question: If the purpose of oaths in the Old Testament was to prevent Israel from lying, Why do oaths at the brink of the New Testament 'come from evil' ( $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\omicron\upsilon$ , 37b)?<sup>7</sup> Wherever oaths are customary, the answer is obvious: the oaths are perverted by means of casuistry into instruments of untruthfulness. Over against this, the divine will for the eschatological community is simple truthfulness, which alone is in accordance with the new covenant.<sup>8</sup>

1 TW. MANSON, Sayings, p. 159.

2 Cf. for example Damascus Rule xv.1f.: '... (He shall not) swear by (the Name), nor by "Aleph" and "Lamed" (Elohim), nor by "Aleph" and "Daleth" (Adonai), but a binding oath by the curses of the covenant. He shall not mention the law of Moses for ... were he to swear and then break (his oath) he would profane the Name.' (Trans. G. VERMES, Scrolls, p. 108) - It is obvious, however, that the sect only replaces the customary oaths by their own 'curses of the Covenant', and thus are still far from a simple 'yes' or 'no'.

3 See above p. 267.

4 Which, according to J. DUPONT, Beatitudes, p. 150, is an editorial interpolation.

5 The formula is, 'Sungguh mati', i.e. (I shall be) certainly dead (if I now do not speak the truth).

6 See however the explanation reported by A. M. HUNTER, Design, p. 52 (in Syria it is still common to swear by your moustache as a man).

7 See to this question also D. BONHOEFFER, Cost, p. 123.

8 This is to say that the present antithesis must be understood as an 'absolute prohibition' within the eschatological community, but not necessarily without. (Cf. A. M. HUNTER, *ibid.*, p. 52).

## (5) The Fifth Antithesis (Mt v.38-42 // Lk vi. 29-30) -

If this passage is considered in the context of the previous four Antitheses, there can be no doubt that it is in something like its ideal form, namely: thesis (38) ; antithesis (39a) - three examples (39b, 40, 41) - a positive statement (42).<sup>1</sup> According to the four-sources hypothesis, however, one must assume that the passage is composite, i.e. that the final redaction conflated two different sources in a most ingenious way: 38, 39a = M; 39b, 40 = Q; 41 = M; 42 = Q.<sup>2</sup> We think that this is rather improbable and prefer to regard the present Antithesis as an original whole.<sup>3</sup>

The fifth thesis refers to the *lex talionis* in the Old Testament (cf. Ex xxi.23-24; Lev xxiv.19-20; Dt xix.21), which 'controlled retaliation in primitive society'.<sup>4</sup> To bring out this point clearly, we may paraphrase vs.38 as follows: 'You have heard that it was said, "Not more than an eye for an eye and not more than a tooth for a tooth" (cf. Gen iv. 23f). 'It is important', T. W. MANSON says, 'to remember that when this rule is first instituted, it is a great advance; for it puts an end to the vendetta, the interminable bloodfeud, as well as to the system of repaying injuries with interest.'<sup>5</sup>

If it is held that the original Antithesis is contained in v.38-39a only, this would mean that it cancels the 'law of measure for measure'.<sup>6</sup> In fact, the divine antithesis reverses the *lex talionis*: it does not advocate 'non-resistance' but rather retaliation of evil with good<sup>7</sup>;

1 Cf. J. DUPONT, *Béatitudes*, pp.150 and 156.

2 So T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 159.

3 For an explanation of Luke's approach to the Antithesis see the following discussion.

4 OAB, n. ad loc.

5 T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 159.

6 Cf. T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 159, and A. M. HUNTER, *Design*, p. 53.

7 So also J. DUPONT *Béatitudes*, p. 174; cf. T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 159: 'Further, it is part of the Christian life to resist evil and overcome it with good.' - D. BONHOEFFER, *Cost*, p. 127, misses this positive aspect, when he maintains, 'The only way to overcome evil is to let it run itself to a standstill because it does not find the resistance it is looking for.' Cf. also p. 129: 'Jesus, however, tells us that it is just because we live in the world, and just because the world is evil, that the precept of non-resistance must be put into practice.' We may recall here also the interpretation of Mt v.39 advocated by LEO TOLSTOY, *My Religion*, pp. 83-86: '...according to His doctrine a man must not resist evil, and, consequently, that whoever adopts His doctrine, cannot resist evil.' (Quoted from H. K. McARTHUR, *Understanding*, p. 107)



But I say to you,  
 Do not resist one who is evil;  
 but if any one strikes you on the right cheek,  
 turn to him the other also;  
 and if any one would sue you to take your coat,  
 let him have your cloak as well;  
 and if any one forces you to go one mile,  
 go with him two miles.  
 Give to him who begs from you,  
 and do not refuse him who would borrow from you.

It is obvious that this antithesis on the whole refers to the relationship between the members of the eschatological community and the 'outsiders' whose intentions are evil. We may think here of the eighth Beatitude, 'Blessed are those who are persecuted, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven' (Mt v.10). The 'one who is evil', then, most probably is no personal enemy but an opponent of the 'kingdom', who wants to work off his feelings on those among whom the kingdom is manifested.<sup>1</sup> In this case, the decisive point on the part of the disciples is that no personal offence is taken. This might be the right interpretation of the paradoxical counsel to turn the other cheek.<sup>2</sup>

In the verses 40f. the limits of non-resistance are transcended explicitly. The first illustration refers to a legal action and is not intended to be a commandment which must be obeyed literally.<sup>3</sup> 'G. KITTEL thinks', T. W. MANSON points out, 'that the Mt. version is original, and Lk an adaption for Gentile readers who would not understand the technicalities of Jewish law. In Lk. we have the picture of the footpad who snatches the outer garment, and is to be presented with the shirt as well.'<sup>4</sup> The vital point probably is how to face injustice which causes material loss. The advice here is to settle the question once and for all, even if this implies letting them have your last garment, and that not with bitterness but rather with the sincere wish, May my cloak keep the 'one who is evil' warm.

---

1 See however A. M. HUNTER, *ibid.*, p. 53: 'What Jesus had in mind was personal wrong, malicious injury inflicted by a personal enemy.'

2 On the 'right' cheek, which may be an editorial interpretation, see T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 51.

3 Cf. A. M. HUNTER, *Design*, p. 55, and T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 51.

4 T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 51.

The next illustration is taken from life under the Roman yoke, for it refers to forced service for the army.<sup>1</sup> It was for a Jew at any rate wise to obey without complaint. But this is not enough for the members of the eschatological community. '...if any one forces you to go one mile', they hear from the lips of Jesus, 'go with him two miles.' Whether or not this actually will be appreciated, it is the will of the heavenly Father to overcome evil with good.

This positive interpretation is stated explicitly in v. 42: 'Give to him ... do not refuse ...'. The persons in view here are not 'evil ones' but beggars and borrowers, i.e. the poor and the needy. Matthew's version here with its clear parallelism certainly is more original than Luke's.<sup>2</sup> The latter, moreover, exaggerates the saying by adding 'every one' (  $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \iota$  ), probably because he uses it as an example of love (cf. vs. 27). The essential meaning is simply 'do good', and that to 'outsiders', in order to overcome all sorts of 'evil'.<sup>3</sup>

#### (6) The Sixth Antithesis (Mt v. 43-48 // Lk vi. 27-28, 32-36) -

The present passage certainly is one of the most important in the synoptic gospels and, at the same time, one that poses very difficult problems. It is not surprising, then, that the views of the scholars differ widely even as to the literary questions involved. T. W. MANSON, on the one hand, assumes that Luke's version is nearer to the original (Q-) Sermon.<sup>4</sup> W. L. KNOX, on the other hand, holds that 'the differences between the Lucan and Matthean versions at Matt. v. 44ff. and Luke vi. 32ff. seem ... to imply a different and superior source for Matthew. Matthew's form seems nearer to the original in certain aspects since the parallelism and the interrogative form, as well as the greater terseness, suggest that Luke has undergone homiletic expansion.'<sup>5</sup>

We doubt that the assumption of two different sources for Luke and Matthew is the proper explanation of the differences. On the contrary, Lk vi. 27 seems to suggest that Luke's source too

1 On this see T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 160.

2 Cf. T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 51: 'The second half (sc. of Lk vi. 30) is a little obscure.'

3 It is worth noting that the expression  $\tau \hat{\omega} \pi \alpha \nu \eta \rho \hat{\omega}$  is ambiguous; it can denote both 'the evil person' and 'the evil thing'.

4 Cf. T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 54: 'In Lk. the poetic structure is again visible. In Mt. the sayings have been rearranged and abbreviated, and other matter has been incorporated with them. It is quite possible that the amount of other matter in Mt outweighs what has been taken from Q.'

5 W. L. KNOX, *Sources II*, p. 24.

contained Antitheses.<sup>1</sup> J. DUPONT has shown convincingly that in the first, fourth, fifth and sixth Antithesis a 'triadic procedure' is typical.<sup>2</sup> This feature is evident in Lk vi. 27-28, whereas Matthew abbreviated it:<sup>3</sup>

But I say to you that hear,

Love your enemies,

(a) do good to those who hate you,

(b) bless those who curse you,

(c) pray for those who abuse you.

Instead of regarding the whole first line as an insertion<sup>4</sup>, it is not unreasonable to think that only the last two words ( τοῖς ἀκούουσιν ) are editorial, whereas the beginning is the rest of the authentic Antithesis. Admittedly, the Greek text in Luke is not identical with that in Matthew,<sup>5</sup> but this might be a question of translation from the original Aramaic or Hebrew.

T. W. MANSON holds that the change from plural to singular in Lk vi. 28/29-31 'indicates that we have here a separate saying'<sup>6</sup>, whereas earlier he pointed out that the Lucan passage vi. 27-31 is 'in strict poetic form'<sup>7</sup>. Over against this it is, we believe, far more probable that Luke's editorial activities were as follows: He inserted here material from the fifth Antithesis according to Mt, namely the verses 29-30 ( Mt v.39-40, 42a), and made from the third element (Mt 42b) a third example, viz. Lk vi. 34, in addition to the two examples in Mt v. 46,47 // Lk vi.32,33.<sup>8</sup>

1 Cf. T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 161: 'It may, therefore, be the case that Mt and Lk are independent in this passage, and that Mt. draws on M, and Lk. on Q. Further, the opening words of Lk. 6.27 suggest that in Q a fragment of this antithesis has been preserved. There would be nothing surprising in this; for the fragment in question gives one of the most striking and characteristic of the teachings of Jesus.' - Given the importance of the teaching on the Mount, it is rather incredible that such a reliable document as the hypothetical 'Q' is thought to report a fragment of the last Antithesis only.

2 See J. DUPONT, *Béatitudes*, p. 156.

3 Cf. J. DUPONT, *ibid.*, p. 155: 'Matthew abbreviates in that he reduces these three propositions to a single one in his fashion.' (See Mt v.10,11,12 - 44b).

4 Cf. T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 50: 'Those who think that the woes are an insertion here explain the words (sc. Lk vi.27, first line) as an attempt to restore the connexion which has been broken.'

5 Mt: ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν / Lk: ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω.

6 T. W. MANSON, *ibid.*, p. 51.

7 *ibid.*, p. 51.

8 So also J. DUPONT, *ibid.*, p. 155.



Furthermore, there is little doubt that Lk vi.35a is editorial, i.e. a transition made necessary because of the previous interpolation (vs. 34).<sup>1</sup> It simply repeats vs. 27 in an abbreviated form and thus suggests that 35b originally followed immediately after the antithesis, as in Mt v.44-45. As to the content of 35b, W. L. KNOX rightly says that we have to do here with a 'Lucan watering down' of Mt v. 45b.<sup>2</sup> Mt v.45a will be discussed together with the conclusion to the Antitheses, i.e. v.48, in the following section.<sup>3</sup> We now turn to the interpretation of the basic Antithesis.

It is well known that the actual commandment, 'You shall ... hate your enemy' is not found in the Old Testament. And if our previous finding that both the thesis and the antithesis contain divine commandments is correct,<sup>4</sup> it is quite impossible that 43c was part of the original thesis. Since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, we know that the background to this gloss most probably is Qumran eschatology.<sup>5</sup> The new initiants of the sect were exhorted to 'love all sons of light, each according to his lot in God's design, and hate all the sons of darkness, each according to his guilt in God's vengeance' (1 QS i.4).<sup>6</sup>

Hence the authentic sixth thesis almost certainly reads like this:

You have heard that it was said,

"You shall love your neighbor".<sup>7</sup>

In this case, the reference is to Lev xix.18: '... you shall love your neighbor as yourself: I am the Lord.' 'The Rabbis', T. W. MANSON explains, 'gave to "neighbour" the widest possible meaning

1 So also J. DUPONT, *Béatitudes*, p. 156.

2 W. L. KNOX, *Sources II*, p. 17, n.1; '(perhaps the original saying was too anthropomorphic for his taste)' (ibid.).

3 J. DUPONT, *ibid.*, pp. 151ff., starts his discussion of the literary problems of the sixth Antithesis with the 'conclusion' v.48; this leads him to incorporate it as a positive statement into this Antithesis, together with the positive statement Mt v. 45 // Lk vi.35 (cf. *ibid.*, p. 156, n.2) His own scheme suggests that this is not correct.

4 See however the third Antithesis, above p. 323.

5 See e.g. M. SMITH, Mt. 5.43 'Hate thine Enemy', *Harv. Theol. Rev.*, 1952, XLV, 71-73; and K. SCHUBERT, *Scrolls - NT*, p. 120.

6 Trans. G. VERMES, *Scrolls*, p. 72.

7 So also T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 161, and A. M. HUNTER, *Design*, p. 57; HUNTER adds, 'The substance of the words is, however, found in OT passages like Deut. 23.6 and Ps. 139.21f.' (The ref. is to 'and hate your enemy').

by including under the term not only born Israelites but also converts to Judaism from the Gentile nations. There was nothing in Lev. 19.18 to indicate to a Jew in the days of Jesus that he ought to love Pontius Pilate.<sup>1</sup> It is most obvious with regard to the present 'Antithesis' how inadequate this designation is. For it goes without saying that the thesis Mt v.43a is a divine precept which continues to be valid as such in spite of the following restatement (cf. Lev xix.18: '... I am the Lord').

On the mountain, the same Lord addressed his eschatological community through the mouth of Jesus:

But I say to you,  
Love your enemies ...<sup>2</sup>

Whoever is meant by the term 'enemies', for those who live in accordance with the divine will expressed here the category of 'enemies' actually ceases to exist. 'The Christian must treat his enemy as a brother, and requite his hostility with love.'<sup>3</sup> For the eschatological community who is 'the salt of the earth' and 'the light of the world' (Mt v.13,14), all nations are 'potential brothers', i.e. fellow-members, of the eschatological community. It is quite probable that the present antithesis - apart from its significance for the present time - points forward to the consummation of the kingdom of heaven. 'I tell you', Jesus said immediately after he came down from the mountain, 'many will come from the east and west and sit at the table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven...' (Mt viii.11).<sup>4</sup> The eschatological community is called to incorporate the former enemies by loving them.

The threefold illustration in Lk vi. 27-28 shows that this love ( ἀγαπᾶν ) is not passive or sentimental but active. It is expressed by 'doing good', by 'blessing', or by 'praying'. What is the positive significance of the new love of the disciples? Verse 45b suggests the answer by pointing to the

---

1 T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 161.

2 For the complete antithesis see above p. 330.

3 D. BONHOEFFER, *Cost*, p. 132.

4 Cf. J. JEREMIAS, *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*, (ET), London 1957, p. 85:  
"And pray for your (ene)mies (cf. Matt. 5.44),  
For he who is not (against you) is for you (cf. Luke 9.50).  
(He that) stands far off (today) will tomorrow be (near you)."

order of nature: sun and rain, in accordance with the will of the Creator, benefit all, 'the evil and the good', 'the just and the unjust'.<sup>1</sup> The point in Matthew is: the new love of the disciples must be unlimited. This is to say it is not what the Creator actually is doing that is exemplary for them but the extent of his activity in nature. Hence it follows that Mt v. 45 par. is the positive statement which belongs to the sixth Antithesis.<sup>2</sup>

The four 'rhetorical questions' in Mt. v. 46, 47 (cf. Lk vi. 32, 33) are most significant just where they are, viz. between the two concepts of 'sonship' (45) and of 'perfection' (48). They point to the 'extraordinary'<sup>3</sup> (περισσότερον, 47), or, to the 'secrets' (μυστήρια, Mt xiii. 11 par.) of the 'Kingdom Way'. The 'extraordinary' is stressed over against the ways of 'the tax collectors' and 'the Gentiles'. It is - after the sixth antithesis - inconsistent to say that this 'reflects Jewish dislike for publicans and Gentiles'.<sup>4</sup> However, Luke seems to feel the same way, for he substitutes the theological expression 'sinners' (ἁμαρτωλοὶ, vi. 32, 33, 34).<sup>5</sup> The tax collectors actually are quoted for their love of those who love them, and the Gentiles for their custom to salute their brethren. Nevertheless they are lacking the hall-mark of a true son of the kingdom, i.e. the 'extraordinary'. We presently turn to the investigation of this feature, which we define as 'the secrets of the Way of Jesus'.

- 
- 1 Luke's paraphrase of this illustration describes sun and rain as expressions of God's kindness (cf. *χρηστός*, vs. 35). Thus he gets a smooth transition to vs. 36: 'Be merciful, even as your Father is merciful.' The idea is, 'God model of mercy.' (J. DUPONT, *Béatitudes*, p. 154) - In Matthew - and, we believe, originally - the two sayings are separated by two other verses.
  - 2 Cf. J. DUPONT, *ibid.*, p. 156, and above p. 120, n. 3: consequently, the suggestion made by CH. C. TORREY, *Our Translated Gospels*, London, n.d., pp. 91f., that Mt v. 48 is a wrong vocalization in Aramaic and should read 'all-including' (gamar), is unnecessary. The idea 'all-including' is already positively expressed in v. 45, whilst v. 48 refers to all Antitheses.
  - 3 For this translation see D. BONHOEFFER, *Cost.* pp. 136ff.
  - 4 W. L. KNOX, *Sources II*, p. 25.
  - 5 We may add here: Luke also replaces *μισθός* by *χάρις*; cf. W. PESCH, *Der Lohngedanke in der Lehre Jesu*, Verglichen mit der religiösen Lohnlehre des Spätjudentums, München 1955, p. 57 (see DUPONT, *ibid.*, p. 155/56).



To sum up the present section, we may recall the basic directions of the heavenly Father, which he addresses through the Son to the eschatological community, in order to guide her in His way:

1. (Mt v.21-24) Respect for the fellow-member.
2. (Mt v.27-30) Respect for women.
3. (Mt v.31-32) True monogamy.
4. (Mt v.33-37) Simple truthfulness.
5. (Mt v.38-42) Retaliation of evil with good.
6. (Mt v.43-47) Unlimited love.

As to the literary question, we find ourselves in agreement with the basic conclusion of J. DUPONT: 'Nothing prevents us admitting, in our view, that on the whole the development of the Antitheses is previous to our Gospels and that from the beginning they were part of the Sermon on the Mount.'<sup>1</sup> This implies that it was not the creation of the Antitheses in the context of the Sermon but at most its edition and reinterpretation by the final redactor of Matthew's Gospel that could be regarded as 'the Christian answer to Jamnia.'<sup>2</sup>

- 1 J. DUPONT, *Béatitudes*, p. 159; we may recall here, however, that DUPONT doubts the authenticity of the third Antithesis (cf. *ibid.*, p. 147). If it actually is an insertion, it is almost certainly as early as the first compilation, and only the 'excepting clause' is interpolated by the final redaction of Matthew. Of course, we cannot be absolutely certain on this point. Our own opinion is that the third Antithesis is authentic, and that for two reasons: (1) Mt xix.9 suggests that Mt. v.31-32 stems not from Mk x.11-12 but from another source; (2) the third Antithesis is closely related to the second.
- 2 W. D. DAVIES, *Setting*, p. 315; cf. also the following sentences: 'Using terms very loosely, the SM is a kind of Christian, mishnaic counterpart to the formulation taking place there. It is not our intention to deny other formative influences on Matthew. ... But this juxtaposition (sc. Sermon-Jamnia), it seems to me, best explains the emergence of Matthew's manifesto. It was the desire and necessity to present a formulation of the way of the New Israel at the time when the rabbis were engaged in a parallel task for the Old Israel that provided the outside stimulus for the evangelist to shape the SM.' - DAVIES is right in saying - against BULTMANN - that the teaching of Jesus calls 'to a way of life illumined by his words' (cf. above p. 313). The Antitheses are the best evidence for this statement.

### 3 The secrets of the Way of Jesus

This is the decisive section of the present study of Christian perfection in the context of the Sermon on the Mount. In order to understand the teaching of Jesus concerning perfection - this is the main purpose of the present study<sup>1</sup> - we have to start from the literary questions and proceed via the interpretation of the final redaction to the original meaning of Mt v. 48.

We begin with a statement concerning the place or function of this saying in the present composition of the Sermon on the Mount: Mt v.48 is the conclusion of the Antitheses.<sup>2</sup> According to J. DUPONT, this is due to the activity of the final redaction of Matthew, which lightly generalized the authentic saying by introducing the adjective 'perfect' (τέλειος).<sup>3</sup>

What is the interpretation of the final redaction with regard to the concept of perfection? This question has been answered recently by two authors who worked independently, namely WOLFGANG TRILLING<sup>4</sup> and GERHARD BARTH<sup>5</sup>. It is worth noting that to a great extent not only their approach but also their findings agree: Both authors begin their investigation with the pericope Mt xix.16f.<sup>6</sup> The final redaction inserts the concept of perfection.<sup>7</sup> There is no question of 'a two-level morality',<sup>8</sup> or, of 'two ways',<sup>9</sup> in that pericope. In fact, the two parallel expressions 'If

---

1 See above p. 19.

2 See e.g. the scheme by T. W. MANSON, Sayings, p. 162.

3 J. DUPONT, Béatitudes, p. 153.

4 W. TRILLING, Das Wahre Israel, (see above p. 8, n10).

5 G. BARTH, Matthew's Understanding of the Law, in: Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, (see above p. 8, n.15).

6 Cf. TRILLING, *ibid.*, p. 165; BARTH, *ibid.*, p. 95.

7 Cf. TRILLING, *ibid.*, p. 166 (cit. V. E. HASLER, Gesetz und Evangelium, p. 22, see above p.8,n6); BARTH, *ibid.*, pp.96 and 97.

8 Cf. BARTH, *ibid.*, p. 96.

9 Cf. TRILLING, *ibid.*, p. 165.

you would enter life' ( εἰ δὲ θέλεις εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν , vs.17) and 'if you would be perfect' ( εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι , vs.21) - which are both editorial - in essence are identical and are given the same answer, namely: 'Keep the commandments, and that in perfect realisation.'<sup>1</sup>

This interpretation of Mt xix.16f. is confirmed by Mt v.48.<sup>2</sup> The latter saying must be understood on the background of the 'more' (περισσότερον) in v.47 and the 'exceeding' (cf. περισσεύω) in v.20.<sup>3</sup> Thus 'perfect' (τέλειος) practically becomes a synonym of 'righteous' (δίκαιος), only, the former is more intensive than the latter.<sup>4</sup> 'In this matter', G. BARTH states, 'the conception of righteousness in Matthew agrees with the Rabbinic one. The difference lies in the fact that this lower level of righteousness, which is no τελειότης is not sufficient for entrance into the kingdom.'<sup>5</sup> BARTH adds that this use of τέλειος is found nowhere except in the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>6</sup>

Even this brief sketch of TRILLING's and BARTH's exposition of the redactional understanding of the concept of perfection shows that their exposition is consistent with the present text of Matthew. In fact, J. DUPONT - who explicitly confines his task to the literary problem - already pointed the way to the same interpretation, when he said, 'The idea of perfection conceived by Matthew seems not to have been separated from his conception of Christian "righteousness", which is defined in the lines of the Jewish conceptions and, in accordance with them, of the function of the Law, but more demanding than Jewish righteousness. Thus one comprehends the close correspondance which exists between the conclusion of the development (v.48) and its introduction (v.17 and above all v.20).'<sup>7</sup>

1 TRILLING, *ibid.*, p. 166.

2 Cf. TRILLING, *ibid.*, p. 166.

3 Cf. TRILLING, *ibid.*, pp. 166, 168 and 169; BARTH, *ibid.*, p. 97.

4 Cf. TRILLING, *ibid.*, p. 168: τέλειος is the 'full measure of "righteousness" expected by God'; BARTH, *ibid.*, p. 97: 'τέλειος in 5.48 denotes the "more" which distinguishes the doers of the teaching of Jesus from others'.

5 BARTH, *ibid.*, p. 97, n.2; cf. also p. 99.

6 Cf. BARTH, *ibid.*, p. 98: note, however, this slight difference between 1 QS and the redaction of Matthew: 'This "more" which trnym means in 1 QS may appear mechanically quantitative as the more of a number of commandments. If this is not the meaning of τέλειος in Matthew the reason is that the law is understood differently; it does not denote a "more" in the sense of the quantitative or extensive, but the intensive.'

7 J. DUPONT, *Béatitudes*, p. 151, n.1.



However, as soon as TRILLING and BARTH investigate more deeply into the background of the concept of perfection evident from the Dead Sea Scrolls and from the Old Testament, they move away from the specific legalistic understanding of perfection which seems to be typical for the final redaction of Matthew.<sup>1</sup> W. TRILLING, on the one hand, finds the idea of 'imitatio Dei' in Mt v.48.<sup>2</sup> His final conclusion is: 'Both texts (sc. Mt xix.16f. and Mt v.47f.) complement each other in that *τελειος* once is connected with love, the other time with the fulfilment of the torah. Perfect fulfilment of the torah and perfect imitation of the love of God are "materialiter" identical.'<sup>3</sup>

G. BARTH, on the other hand, inserts the Old Testament concept of perfection into the redactional understanding of *τελειος*, in order to answer the question, 'whether discipleship is the way to perfection or is already "perfection" itself'.<sup>4</sup> Although BARTH admits that one would expect the possibility mentioned first to be the right answer, he concludes, 'This is contradicted, however, by the fact that Matthew does not use *τελειος* in the Greek sense of the perfect ethical personality, but in the Old Testament sense of the wholeness of consecration to God, as the close relationship with the use of *tnym* in 1 QS shows.'<sup>5</sup> In our opinion, this is not the right alternative from the point of view of the final redaction of Matthew. It is more in accordance with the Matthean-Rabbinic concept of perfection described by BARTH<sup>6</sup> that it stands for the goal of discipleship that will eventually

---

1 Cf. J. DUPONT, *ibid.*, p. 151, the remark concerning the concept of perfection at Qumran.

2 Cf. TRILLING, *ibid.*, p. 168, and also n.53.

3 *ibid.*, p. 169.

4 BARTH, *ibid.*, p. 101.

5 *ibid.*, p. 101.

6 Cf. BARTH *ibid.*, p. 97, n.1 (see above p.336).

be attained by those who will be chosen in judgment to enter the kingdom of heaven (cf. Mt v.20; xxv.31-46).<sup>1</sup>

The notion of 'perfection' as the goal of the Christian life is very widespread, especially in devotional literature. However, many scholars hold that this notion is based on the evidence of the New Testament. R. NEWTON FLEW, who explicitly states that Mt v.43-48 is 'the key to any teaching of perfection',<sup>2</sup> arrives at the following conclusion after discussing 'teleios in the Pauline Letters' as well: 'The full Christian perfection is attainable only in the other life beyond the grave.'<sup>3</sup> E. J. TINSLEY, who is also referring to Mt v.48, says, 'Christian discipleship ... (is) the road to "perfection" through following in the "Way" of Christ...'<sup>4</sup>

In this connection, mention must be made again of the findings summarized by TORBJÖRN OSNES at the end of his comprehensive study of perfection: 'Considering the term *τέλειος* we find that it appears as a goal for those having entered into the new mankind, into the Body of Christ. In fact, it appears as a goal for the entire new humanity. Both the individual man and the Body of Christ are here considered in their historical existence. Thus it is assumed that the individual member of the Body of Christ has not yet, in his historical existence reached the goal which God has set him. Nor does the Body of Christ per se contain the fulness of Christ.'<sup>5</sup> 'To be *τέλειος*, then, has in the New Testament the meaning of belonging with one's whole being to the eschatological reality, and being directed from here in one's historical existence. Thus the term is eschatologically coloured. That man only, who in this time is to be found in this reality, will, when the new era dawns, be allowed to enter the perfect kingdom of God.'<sup>6</sup>

---

1 Cf. G. BORNKAMM, *Matthew*, p. 30: 'Never, however, are the disciples altogether and, as such, already righteous. Rather, they are summoned to the better righteousness (5.20; 6.33); not until the coming judgment will the righteous shine as the sun (13.43), when the angels will separate the wicked from the midst of the righteous (13.49).' 'As the redaction of Matthew introduces the concept of 'better righteousness' as a synonym of 'perfection' (cf. *ibid.*, p. 37), this statement applies to the latter as well: never are the disciples as such already 'perfect'.

2 R. N. FLEW, *Jesus*, p. 15.

3 *ibid.*, p. 18.

4 E. J. TINSLEY, *Imitation*, p. 114.

5 T. OSNES, *Teleios*, p. 355, (see above p.9).

6 *ibid.*, p. 371.

We are not concerned here with the question whether or not OSNES' interpretation of the New Testament concept of perfection is correct. The relevant point here is that his interpretation to a certain extent is in line with the understanding of the final redaction of Matthew. Concerning the latter, we may also compare the most recent discussion by W. D. DAVIES. As DAVIES holds the term 'perfect' in Mt v.48 to be 'a deliberate change' and in xix.21 introduced by Matthew,<sup>1</sup> he is concerned with the redactional view. It is not easy to follow his discussion, because on the one hand he constantly compares the Matthean concept of perfection with that of Qumran, whereas on the other hand he maintains that Jesus was concerned with a dialogue between his disciples and Qumran, whilst Matthew was concerned with a dialogue between the Christian Church and Pharisaic Judaism.<sup>2</sup>

We may quote here first DAVIES' description of RIGAUX's position:<sup>3</sup> '(2) To distinguish the meanings of "perfect" in v.48 and xix.21, but nevertheless to regard both as Semitic. Such is the position of Rigaux. He interprets v.48 in the light of Deut. xviii.13 and Lev. xix.22. The main emphasis in v.48 is on whole-hearted devotion to the imitation of God, not in the perfection of his being, but of his ways. It is implied that there is a parallel here to the concept of "perfection" at Qumran, although Rigaux does not make this explicit. In xix.21 the same scholar finds a distinction between two grades of Christian commitment, an ordinary one and one of "perfection" which implies giving away all and following Jesus ("Faire partie du groupe qui suit Jésus partout"). Such a distinction he does not find in Qumran, where all the community are perfect. On this view, only in one instance does the Matthean treatment of perfection suggest Qumran and this can be explained in terms of the Old Testament without calling in Qumran influence at all.<sup>4</sup> DAVIES' criticism is, 'Rigaux recognizes a twofold morality in xix.21, but does not note that this contradicts v.48.'<sup>5</sup>

---

1 W. D. DAVIES, *Setting*, p. 210.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 255: 'The sectarians had been given a rigid interpretation of the Law, by the Teacher of Righteousness, which was designed to lead to perfection. There is every reason to believe that Jesus offered an interpretation of the Law which was set over against this, his radicalism standing over against that of Qumran. But when Matthew constructed his "Sermon" he utilized the tradition of the teaching for his own purpose - to set the Christian ethic not over against Qumran but over against Pharisaic Judaism, the ethic of the New Israel over against that of the Old.'

3 See above p.8, n.2, and pp. 177ff.

4 *ibid.*, p. 210.

5 *ibid.*, p. 213, n.1. (cf. RIGAUX, *op. cit.* pp. 248ff.).



DAVIES defines the view of the final redaction of Matthew as follows: 'On the basis of v.48 and xix.21, therefore, it is possible to claim that, as Matthew understood it, the Christian community as a totality was called to be perfect, a "house of perfection", in the sense that it was to conform to the interpretation of the Law given by Jesus, as were the Sectarians to that of the Teacher of Righteousness. But two factors make it difficult to allow such an emphasis in Matthean ecclesiology. First, the possibility is not to be ruled out that any Matthean emphasis on perfection is in conscious opposition to that urged on the Sectarians. ... Secondly, and this must be pressed, were the motif of perfection in any way as significant for Matthew as this suggested, and as it was at Qumran, we should expect far more references to it. The occurrence of a term in two passages does not by itself enable us to reconstruct a substantial element in Matthean ecclesiology. ...'<sup>1</sup>

Later in his discussion, DAVIES finds that the term 'perfect' occurs in connection with 'moral obedience' both in Matthew and in the Scrolls. 'There can be little doubt', he concludes, 'that we are confronted with similar conceptions (sc. like those at Qumran) in Matthew. The perfection it demands is obedience to the true interpretation of the Law. But such a true interpretation has only been made available by a revelation of the mysteries of the Kingdom and of the Law to the disciples of Jesus. ... The Church in Matthew is an eschatological community dedicated to a perfection based on a revealed knowledge of the purposes of God and of its true intent in the Law, as was the Sect at Qumran, except that Jesus was even more central for the former than was the Teacher of Righteousness for the latter. ... True, the Teacher of Righteousness did not interpret the Law in the same way as did Jesus, so that the commandments which were set before the Sect and the Church respectively were very different. Nevertheless, those commandments were marked by one common feature: they were radical, except that, if we may so put it, this radicalism was expressed in a demand for more and more obedience by Qumran (that is, it was quantitative), and for deeper and deeper obedience by Jesus (that is, his demand was qualitatively different).'<sup>2</sup> We may add here that in another context DAVIES says, 'The demand for "imitatio Dei", expressed in v.48, becomes that for "imitatio Christi".'<sup>3</sup>

1 W. D. DAVIES, Setting, p. 213.

2 *ibid.*, pp. 215/16.

3 *ibid.*, p. 95.

And at the beginning of his discussion about The Dead Sea Sect, he mentions three emphases that emerge in Matthew, namely: 'on "perfection" as the goal of the community, on "knowledge" as the means to this goal, and, finally, on a "true" interpretation of the Law as its ground.'<sup>1</sup>

To sum up our own view: The final redactor of Matthew interpreted the concept of perfection, which he found in the oldest Jesus tradition in the context of the Sermon on the Mount, in the following way: (1) By creating Mt v.20 as an introduction to the Antitheses corresponding to their conclusion v.48, he defined 'perfection' by 'better righteousness' and, at the same time, related it to the future kingdom of heaven, thereby - most probably - suggesting that 'perfection' stands for the goal of discipleship. (2) To be quite clear as to the answer of the important question, How can a disciple attain perfection? - he interpolated the concept of perfection in Mt xix.21 and stressed again its futuristic significance by adding, 'if you would enter life' in vs. 17. The answer - which according to the understanding of the redactor is already implied in the context of the Sermon - is unmistakeably stated by means of a slight alteration: 'Keep' (τῆρετε, over against 'you know' in Mk x.19 // Lk xviii.20) 'the commandments' (vs.17). The following context shows that this must be done by following the Way of Christ, which - as G. STRECKER has shown<sup>2</sup> - for the redactor is the Way of Righteousness. (3) If the redactor regarded Mt v.48 as an expression of 'imitatio Dei', DAVIES may be right that he understood it in terms of 'imitatio Christi'.

At this point, we may consider for a moment the interpretation of Christian perfection by Luke, which, of course, belongs to the redactional level as well. The situation of the Church - which perhaps also was the reason for Matthew's re-interpretation of the concept of perfection found in the tradition - seems to have developed further at the time Luke wrote his Gospel. 'With the decline of the expectation of an immanent Parousia', H. CONZELMANN says, 'the theme of the message is no longer the coming of the Kingdom, from which the call to repentance arises of its own accord, but now, in the time of waiting, the important thing is the "way" of salvation, the "way" into the Kingdom.'<sup>3</sup> With the kingdom removed into the distant future and - since the day of Pentecost - with the Spirit as the guarantee for

---

1 W. D. DAVIES, Setting, p. 209.

2 See G. STRECKER, Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit; (cf. above p. 12, n.2).

3 H. CONZELMANN, Luke, (cf. above p. 12, n.2) p. 227.

Christian hope, one would expect Luke to re-interpret 'perfection' in terms of the Spirit.<sup>1</sup> But for Luke the historian (cf. 1.1-4), this is impossible: before Pentecost, 'the Spirit rests upon one person only',<sup>2</sup> namely Jesus. Thus, Luke's view of the sequence of redemptive history and the shift of emphasis in eschatology probably are the main reasons why he re-interprets 'perfection' in terms of mercy, or, strictly speaking, eliminates the concept of perfection.

The investigation of the context of Lk vi. 36 reveals another reason why Luke might have changed the term 'perfect' into 'merciful' (οἰκτιρῶν). G. BARTH and others argue, 'If the Matthean form had stood in Q, Luke would have turned a good conclusion into a worse.'<sup>3</sup> As soon as we recognize that Luke almost certainly knew the fifth and the sixth Antitheses and perhaps the rest of them too,<sup>4</sup> while he reported only the last, this argument is not convincing. For in this case he could no more use a saying that obviously is the conclusion of the whole series of Antitheses.<sup>5</sup> Admittedly, there is still some doubt among New Testament scholars as to the authentic function of Mt v. 48. 'Whether the last imperative is to be taken as the end of the complex, or whether, as in Luke (and then in Luke's form) it is the beginning of what follows, is in my view', says R. BULTMANN, 'uncertain'.<sup>6</sup> In another book, however, the same scholar slightly changed his opinion: 'The saying is of course preserved in another form, "Be merciful as your Father is merciful" (Luke 6:36). But the first form is probably the older, and was changed by Luke to make a transition to the following section.'<sup>7</sup>

Of course, the reasons mentioned above for Luke's alteration in vi. 36 are conjectural. Nevertheless his redactional activity is quite intelligible: He reduced the Antitheses, i.e. the 'law' of the eschatological community, to the commandment of unlimited love, perhaps in accordance with

1 Cf. R. N. FLEW, *Jesus*, p. 17: 'What content did he (sc. Paul) read into the word *teleios*? He answers our question that the *teleioi*, whom he identifies with the "spiritual" men, can share with him the wisdom that comes from above by the Holy Spirit.'

2 H. CONZELMANN, *Luke*, p. 184.

3 BARTH, *ibid.*, p. 97, n.1.

4 See above p. 330 and *ibid.*, n.1.

5 Note that Luke omits the οὐδ'.

6 R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p. 79, cf. *ibid.*, p. 88.

7 R. BULTMANN, *Jesus*, p. 88.



the idea expressed also in Rom xiii.8-10: '... love is the fulfilling of the law.' It could indeed be argued that Luke's whole composition in vi. 27-38 is a Sermon about love and that therefore - as well as for the reasons already mentioned - he adapted vs. 36 to this main theme. In our opinion, it is only after Luke's alterations - including the joining of vs. 35b (cf. Mt v.45) to vs.36 (cf. Mt v.48) - that the idea of 'imitatio Dei' emerges clearly: The mercies of God reveal him as 'the supreme example for imitation',<sup>1</sup> whereas God's 'perfection' - as we shall see below - in fact is no matter of imitation.<sup>2</sup> T. W. MANSON comments on vs. 36: 'We are to copy this god-like way - and are able to do so - just because we have experienced its working ourselves. We love, because He first loved us (1 John 4.19).'<sup>3</sup>

Now, the attempt must be made to trace as far as we may the interpretation of Jesus himself. As we have seen above,<sup>4</sup> the form of Mt v.48 suggests that this saying is modelled on Lev xix.2: 'Say to all the congregation of the people of Israel,

You shall be holy (q<sup>e</sup> dhoshim)

for (ki) I the Lord your God am holy (qadhosh).'

(LXX = Ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε .

ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν )

As Jesus quoted Lev xix.18 in Mt v.48, it is quite clear that he knew the context of Lev xix.2, i.e. the so-called 'Holiness Code', and the significance of this saying: to be 'holy' is the main characteristic of the people of Israel, or the main condition for its mission, namely to be the priest of Yahweh among the nations.<sup>5</sup> Consequently, we may assume that to be τέλειος is the main characteristic of the eschatological community, or the main condition for its mission, namely to be 'the salt of the earth' and 'the light of the world'.<sup>6</sup>

1 Cf. P. J. DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, p. 171; the last sentence of the paragraph from which the expression quoted above is taken reads, 'The parallel passage of Luke 6.36 forms a fitting and final testimony to the issue: "Be merciful even as your Father is merciful" (οἱ κτίρμων).'

2 So also M. BUBER, *Two Types of Faith* (ET), London 1951, p. 60: 'There (sc. Lk vi.36) we find "compassionate" instead of "perfect", and compassion can be imitated while perfection cannot.'

3 T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 55.

4 See above pp. 128/29.

5 Cf. above p. 134.

6 Cf. E. J. TINSLEY, *Imitation*, p. 114: 'This saying (sc. Mt v.48 par.) of Jesus occupies the place in the life of his community which the Levitical saying, "You shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy" (Lev. 19.2), held in the Old Israel.' On the mission of the eschatological community see above pp. 298ff.

As the Greek term  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$  translates the Hebrew tamim or shalem,<sup>1</sup> or else the Aramaic  $sh^e lim$ ,<sup>2</sup> we may conclude that the alteration from  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$  // qadhosh to  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$  // tamim is not merely a matter of (mis)translation but rather is intentional. What is the reason for Jesus' replacing of the concept of 'holiness' by the concept of 'wholeness' as the main characteristic of the eschatological community? In the context of the Holiness Code, and explicitly in Lev xx.26, the negative aspect of holiness, i.e. 'I the Lord ... have separated you from the peoples', is present together with its positive aspect, i.e. 'that you should be mine'. In the time of Jesus, it seems that the positive aspect of belonging to Yahweh was taken for granted (cf. e.g., Mt iii.9), whereas the negative aspect was emphasized, and that in the sense of separation from the Gentiles and from idolatry, as K. G. KUHN has pointed out with reference to Rabbinic Judaism.<sup>3</sup> This, then, may be the reason why Jesus used tamim instead of qadhosh: 'You must be holy', according to the contemporary interpretation could be understood as a commandment to keep clear from the Gentiles, or, from the enemies, which is the very opposite of the final antithesis, 'Love your enemies ...' (Mt v.44).<sup>4</sup>

Furthermore, it could be argued that Israel as a nation and thus every member of 'the congregation of the people of Israel' was considered to be 'holy'. Therefore, when Jesus called disciples out of Israel in order to form the eschatological community, they had, of course, not to be holy as every one else in Israel but in a special way. Or, as we found in our previous chapter, they had to be initiated into a special close relationship with the holy God. As far as we can see,

---

1 Cf. above p. 7 (cit. BULTMANN), and p. 133.

2 Cf. M. BLACK, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, (2nd ed.), Oxford 1954, p. 138/39: 'One of the more interesting examples of paranomasia occurs in Mt v.47,48: the regular Semitic expression for "to greet" is "to ask for the peace or welfare ( $sh^e lam$ ) of", and  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$  is  $sh^e lim$ ; ... In view of the word-play in Matthew ... it seems more probable that the first Gospel has preserved the original form of the saying as spoken by Jesus, perhaps a modification of the popular form, and that it is to the influence of the Targumic form of the words that the Lucan variant is due.'

3 Cf. K. G. KUHN, art.  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , in: TWNT I, p. 101.

4 The saying Mt x.5,6, 'Go nowhere among the Gentiles, and enter no towns of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel', as we have seen above (pp. 218 and 251f.), must be understood against the background of Jesus' expectation of the final manifestation of God's glory to the world, through which God himself will summon the nations to Jerusalem.

in Deuteronomy this is already expressed by means of the term 'tamim':

You shall be wholly consecrated to Yahweh your God (Dt xviii.13).<sup>1</sup>

(LXX = τέλειος ἔσῃ ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου )

Accordingly, the authentic meaning of Mt v.48a, Ἔσθε ... ὅμους τέλειοι , may be: 'You shall be ... wholly consecrated ... '. As we have seen above,<sup>2</sup> almost the same idea is contained in the Hebrew expression 'bhar-lebhabh' ('a pure heart') which is found both in the entrance-liturgy' Ps xxiv.4 and in the sixth Beatitude.<sup>3</sup> Thus the third and most important reason for Jesus' replacing of 'holy' by 'perfect' ('whole') seems to be that the latter occurs in the context of the 'entrance-liturgies', namely in Ps xxiv.4 and especially in Ps xv.2.<sup>4</sup> Perhaps we even may go a step further and suggest; Jesus' choice of the main characteristic of the eschatological community suggests that we have to do in Mt v.48a with the 'conditio sine qua non' for its membership and mission.

ERNST PERCY has made the point that the terms shalem and tamim are merely formal concepts and, consequently, that Mt v.48 cannot have been an isolated saying from the beginning.<sup>5</sup> This, in our view, is right in the sense that this saying almost certainly belongs to the context of the authentic Sermon since it was uttered by Jesus on the Mount. In fact, the basic problem is this: What does 'whole' ( τέλειοι , 48a) refer to? About sixty years ago, THEODOR ZAHN pointed the way to the right interpretation when he suggested that in Mt v.48 Jesus requires of his disciples 'complete devotion to ... the revealed will of God'.<sup>6</sup> JULIUS SCHNIEWIND says, falling into line with ZAHN, 'Wholly for God! just as he in himself is undivided, like himself.'<sup>7</sup> In this connection we may mention also R. GREGOR SMITH, who understands Mt v.48 against the background of Dt xviii. 13, 1 Kg viii.61 and xi.4, where 'tamim is used as an expression of the cult': 'To be perfect, means, therefore, to be whole or sound or

1 On this saying and other occurrences of tamim see above pp. 135/36, 141ff.

2 Cf. p. 145f., and p. 148f.

3 See above p. 288.

4 See above p. 140/41.

5 Cf. E. PERCY, op. cit., p. 163.

6 TH. ZAHN, Mt, p. 255; on the same p. ZAHN says, 'the devotion of the whole person in contrast to incompleteness and hypocrisy'. It must be noted that the expression quoted above refers to the will of God revealed in the law and in nature.

7 J. SCHNIEWIND, Mt, p. 70.



true; and to be perfect as the heavenly Father is perfect (Matt. 5.48, the main NT reference) means to be wholly turned, with the whole will and being, to God, as he is turned to us.<sup>1</sup> Thus according to a cultic interpretation the term  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\iota$  refers to God Himself, or, corresponding to 48b, to the heavenly Father.

If  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\iota$  in Mt v.48a refers to God himself, the legalistic understanding of perfection by the final redaction of Matthew is secondary. And the same is true of a 'quantitative' understanding of perfection, which G. STRECKER claims to be the view of the redactor.<sup>2</sup> In the following comment on the Antitheses - including Mt v.48 - BULTMANN seems to advance a 'quantitative' understanding too: 'In all these passages the decisive requirement is the same: the good which is to be done is to be done completely.'<sup>3</sup> Later in the same book, however, BULTMANN explicitly states that Jesus' words must be understood from the Semitic conception of 'perfect', and that in the sense 'that the conduct of man should be whole and undivided, not this and that together; true and exact, unwavering, no running back and forth. And', he adds, 'this requirements is based on the reference to God Himself, with whom also there is only the Either - Or, not Both - And.'<sup>4</sup>

G. BORNKAMM, expounding Jesus' own view, rightly rejects a 'quantitative' understanding of 'perfection'. 'The truth', he says, 'is that the new righteousness is quantitatively a new and different attitude. In accordance with the biblical idiom elsewhere, neither the concept of "righteousness" nor that of "perfection" could be exceeded. "You, therefore, must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Mt. v.48). This is not an ideal which may be achieved step by step, but means "wholeness" in comparison with all dividedness and brokenness; a state of being, a stance whose reality is in God. In the demand which he makes upon them, Jesus points the disciples, with the greatest emphasis, to God - the God who will come and is already present and active. To live on the basis of God's presence and in expectation of his future, this is what Jesus aims at in his commandment: "That you may be the children of your Father who is in heaven!"'<sup>5</sup>

1 R. G. SMITH, art. 'Perfect', in: TWBB, p. 167.

2 See G. STRECKER, op. cit., p. 141; cf. also *ibid.*, p. 142: 'Thus the requested perfection is decided essentially by the quantitative increase.'

3 R. BULTMANN, Jesus, p. 70.

4 *ibid.*, p. 89.

5 G. BORNKAMM, Jesus of Nazareth (ET, rev. ed.) London 1963, p. 108.

BORKHAMM's exposition of Jesus' own view of 'perfection' needs qualification in so far as the concept of 'righteousness' is synonymous with 'perfection' only according to the redactional view. Therefore, it must be avoided in the present context. Furthermore, we have to be careful with the use of ontological terminology ("wholeness" means 'a state of being (German: 'ein Sein') ... whose reality is in God'), for this way of thinking is foreign to the Hebrew mind. What actually is the difference between a 'quantitative' and a 'qualitative' attitude (BORNKAMM), or demand (DAVIES), between 'more' obedience and 'deeper' obedience (DAVIES)? According to Mt vii.24-27 Jesus demands, in BONHOEFFER's words, 'simple obedience' ('einfältigen Gehorsam').<sup>1</sup>

The cultic interpretation of 'perfection' in the context of the Sermon on the Mount may clarify the authentic meaning: As the religious term *tamim* is a cultic and relational concept both in the Old Testament and - perhaps - also at Qumran, Jesus' emphasis most probably is on relationship with God Himself: 'You ... must be wholly consecrated, namely to your heavenly Father.' Does this imply, in Paul's words, 'I appeal to you therefore brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice ( *θυσίαν ζώσαν* ), holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship. Do not be conformed to this world but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that you may prove what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect ( *καὶ τέλειον* )' (Rom xii.1-2)? As we have seen above,<sup>2</sup> the same image is found already in the Scrolls, and that parallel to the expression 'perfection of way' (cf. 1 QS ix.4-5)<sup>3</sup>. At any rate, the reapplication of the old condition laid down for the sacrificial victim to the members of the eschatological community implies that they belong to God 'in wholeness of consecration' - like a sacrificial animal.

We note that both BORNKAMM and BULTMANN in their statements quoted above speak of the reference to God in the matter of 'wholeness', meaning Mt v.48b. However, they do not seem to be surprised by this part of the saying, whereas in fact what is said here <sup>5</sup>in unheard-of: In the Old Testament, the epithet 'tamim' is never applied to Yahweh Himself.<sup>4</sup>

1 Cf. D. BONHOEFFER, *Cost*, part I, chapter 3.

2 Cf. p. 186.

3 On 'The Christian Sacrifices' see A. RICHARDSON, *Theology*, pp. 297ff.

4 See above p. 150.

The significance of Mt v. 48b is clearly recognised by OTTO MICHEL, when he says, 'he (sc. Jesus) even adds, thereby surpassing the Old Testament formula (Dt xviii. 13): "as your heavenly Father is perfect". From God's perfection originates the perfection of the disciples of Jesus, just as from the holiness of God the holiness of the people (Lev xix. 2). Perfection and holiness are not the work of man, not even the goal of a moral development, but the grace of God.'<sup>1</sup> The vital point of Mt v. 48, or, of Jesus' understanding of perfection, then, is the second part of this saying, ... *ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν*.

In the first place, we may ask: What is the significance of the correlative *ὡς*?<sup>2</sup> 'It must be clear', P. J. DUPLESSIS answers, 'that if these words contain an intimation of the innate perfection of God, the imperative to the disciples would be perfectly senseless. By pointing to God as the supreme Example for imitation, Jesus is referring to the way in which He reveals Himself. ... God acts, to put it anthropomorphically, with an undivided heart and a compassion transcending the most obdurate boundaries of hostility. The correlative is therefore not ontological but modal. This corroborates the interpretation of *teleios* as valid in the realm of love.'<sup>3</sup> From the same presupposition, viz. that Mt v. 48 refers to the sixth antithesis, E. J. TINSLEY suggests that this saying is 'the summons of the disciples to the life of the *imitatio Dei*'.<sup>4</sup> But whereas DU PLESSIS does not pay any attention to Lev xix. 2 in this matter, TINSLEY quotes the latter saying as a motto under the heading of his fourth chapter: 'Israel as "Imitator Dei"'.<sup>5</sup> He seems to overlook the fact that it does not read, 'You shall be holy, as I the Lord your God am holy', but rather 'for' (*כי*), i.e. because I the Lord your God am holy.

1 O. MICHEL, *Die Lehre von der christlichen Vollkommenheit nach der Anschauung des Hebräerbriefes*, in: TSK, Fünftes Heft, 1934/35, p. 343; the beginning of the sentence quoted reads like this: 'Jesus for the first time in early Christianity relates according to Mt v. 48 perfection and love; over against all righteousness through works, over against all false moralization and secularization Jesus acknowledges the dependence on God; ... (cit.). 'About the relationship between perfection and love see the following discussion.

2 Cf. P. J. DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, p. 171: 'd. Significance of the correlative (*ὡς*)'.

3 *ibid.*, p. 171.

4 E. J. TINSLEY, *Imitation*, p. 114.

5 See *ibid.*, p. 50.



J. H. THAYER classifies the  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  of Mt v.48b among the instances which make reference 'to a quality which really belongs to a person or thing'.<sup>1</sup> It may be asked, however, whether the emphasis on  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  is not stronger, i.e. whether ' $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ' is used to present, in form of a comparison, a motive which is urged upon one', and thus, in this case, 'has almost the force of a causal particle'.<sup>2</sup> If this is right, we may translate - in accordance with the 'model' Lev xix.2 - '... for your heavenly Father is perfect.'

Although O. MICHEL's understanding of perfection in Mt v.48 is slightly different<sup>3</sup>, the following statement seems to point the way to the interpretation advanced here: 'For Matthew the perfection of the disciples in the last resort is the result of the perfection of the Father (Mt v.48), ... For Matthew the perfection in the last resort is based on a divine quality ( $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ ), ...'.<sup>4</sup> The very formulation of vs. 48b - at least in Greek seems to confirm this statement: 'as (for) your heavenly Father is ( $\epsilon^2\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ ) perfect', not; acts perfectly. Is this 'an imitation of the innate perfection of God' in spite of DU PLESSIS' denial? We have seen that besides the alternative suggested by this author, viz. either ontological or modal, there is a third possibility: the correlative  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  is causal.

Even if the  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  of vs.48b does not have the force of a causal particle, it certainly refers to something which at the moment the saying is uttered is known by the disciples: 'You, therefore, must be perfect, as'  $\Upsilon\alpha\eta\omega\epsilon\eta$  is perfect. As we have seen above, the final redaction of Matthew re-interpreted this saying, i.e. the conclusion of the Antitheses, by means of the editorial introduction to the same, namely Mt v.17-20. If we eliminate this section as a redactional

1 J. H. THAYER, Lexicon NT, p. 681.

2 *ibid.*, p. 681.

3 See above p. 348, n.1.

4 O. MICHEL, Vollkommenheit Heb., p. 349; the whole statement in fact is a comparison between Mt and Heb; the parts referring to Heb - omitted above - read: '... for the Hebrews the final goal ( $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ ) of an ancient decree ( $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}$ ). ... , for the Epistle to the Hebrews in a final divine legality ( $\epsilon^2\pi\rho\epsilon\pi\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}$ ).'

interpolation, Mt v.13-16 takes the place of an introduction, or, in other words, emerges as the first 'bracket' between which - we believe - Jesus himself put the Antitheses. The second 'bracket', then, is Mt v.48. We found that the passage Mt v.13-16 presupposes a theophany and, consequently, God's presence in the midst of his eschatological community.<sup>1</sup> Hence it is reasonable to assume that Mt v.48b refers to God's coming and presence in the midst of his eschatological community, and that in the sense, 'as your heavenly Father is wholly consecrated,' namely to his community.

In his discussion about  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$  in the Septuagint, P. J. DU PLESSIS says 'Tamim is valid in exactly the same religious atmosphere of relation and decreed purpose (sc. as  $\text{q}^{\text{e}}\text{dhaqah}$ ), and of proportions being what they should be. To be taken up in this relationship absolutely and completely makes a man "perfect" and admits him to the most intimate concourse of God's people, the  $\text{q}^{\text{e}}\text{hal Yahweh}$ . This is the most basic description of perfection in the O.T., a religious concept imbued with the idea of integration and solidarity. In this sense of an integrate fellowship governing the life of each within the community in all its aspects,  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$  serves as a translation for and assumes the innate meaning of tamim.'<sup>2</sup> As far as we can see, DU PLESSIS does not make use of this passage for the understanding of perfection in the context of the Sermon on the Mount. However, it links up with the findings of a cultic interpretation of the Sermon: The eschatological community, i.e. the circle of disciples on the Mount, is such a community where everything centres around Yahweh. To be taken up, or initiated into the relationship with God is the realisation of perfection. The community as a whole came into existence through God's coming, or, in other words, through the revelation of His entire consecration to the circle of disciples. It is most significant that this revelation occurred on the 'Cosmic Mountain', for this suggests that the statement, i.e., in short: YHWH tamim, is not

1 See above p. 303/04.

2 P. J. DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, p. 97: on the difference between 'righteousness' ( $\text{q}^{\text{e}}\text{dhaqah}$ ) and 'perfection' (tom, tam), see above p. 154.

restricted to Israel alone. The circle of disciples represents mankind (cf. Mt v.13a, 14a).

As to the aspect of 'unconditionality' of Yahweh's perfection revealed on the mountain,<sup>1</sup> the place of Mt v.48 in the context of the Sermon is significant: this saying is pronounced by Jesus only after the fulfilment of the conditions for admission by the disciples, the initiation, the divine decree and the promulgation of the Antitheses. In fact, the eschatological community cannot be perfect, or, to use R. G. SMITH's paraphrase, cannot turn wholly to God, if God Himself does not wholly turn to His community and, moreover, turns the face of each member in His direction. This implies, as we have seen above, in the previous chapter, that the realisation of perfection is not attained merely by a rite of initiation.

O. MICHEL arrived at the same conclusion in view of the New Testament as a whole: '... perfection is no goal which can be reached because man is baptized. The N.T. denies that the Corinthians and the "Hebrews" are perfect, although they are baptized. Not in the sacrament but only in God lies the possibility of Christian perfection; nevertheless one may say that God does not desert his work (Phil i.6; Heb vi.10) and that human fault separates from perfection (Heb vi. 7-8). As a perfect one too the *τέλειος* remains a *μαρτύρων* and cannot deny his imperfection.'<sup>2</sup> The cultic interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount has thrown new light on the aspect of Christian perfection mentioned in this statement. The Beatitudes, so to speak, put away the human faults which separate man from God's presence. But for all that, the realisation of perfection, i.e. the wholeness of the disciples' consecration, can only be attained through God's initiative, i.e. through His 'coming' to dwell in the midst of His eschatological community, or through the wholeness of his consecration.

---

1 See above p. 154.

2 O. MICHEL, *Vollkommenheit* Heb. p. 347; the term 'imperfection' in the last sentence seems to be used in an ethical sense. We shall discuss the view of the Hebrews on perfection in the following chapter.



At this point, we may return to T. OSNES' findings. In his summary, he repeatedly speaks about the 'new reality' into which a Christian is baptized and which is described in different ways in the New Testament. 'As a preliminary result', he says at one stage, 'we want to stress that full initiation into and full knowledge of the reality into which man enters through Baptism, belongs to Christian perfection. Man cannot reach this himself, he has to submit himself to the revealing work of the Spirit, bound up with the preaching. - The NT goes further than this. The goal of those having entered into the new reality, is not only to get to know this reality and be completely initiated. This entails a knowledge as a result of which a man can walk worthily. This "walking worthily" seems to proceed from knowledge, from the wisdom which comes from above, or, to put it in another way, from the heart which has received the word and where the Spirit dwells.'<sup>1</sup>

It is quite certain that the 'new reality', into which the disciples on the mountain were initiated, for Jesus himself was identical with the kingdom of heaven. In fact, we may regard Mt v.48b as a stage of the development of the conception of 'kingship', which had its origin in the Canaanite conception of deity. WERNER SCHMIDT describes this development as far as the Old Testament is concerned: 'The history of the title "king" discloses itself as a slow but radical process of demythologizing. The mythological concept of a god as king over other gods becomes Israel's faith in the King Yahweh who is graciously turned to her and at the same time is the Lord of the earth and the nations. King is now the Lord who dwells on Zion in the midst of his people.'<sup>2</sup>

Jesus went considerably farther in Mt v.48b, which may be paraphrased: King is now your heavenly Father who dwells on the cosmic mountain in the midst of his eschatological community. The last stage of this development, we believe, was reached in the early Church, to which we may ascribe the following position: King is now the Holy Spirit, or, the Risen Christ,<sup>3</sup> who dwells in the heart of the Christians.

---

1 T. OSNES, Teleios, p. 357/58.

2 W. SCHMIDT, Königtum Gottes, p. 75.

3 For the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Risen Christ see A. RICHARDSON, Theology, pp.120ff.: 'The "Personality" of the Holy Spirit'.

The title 'Father' - like the title 'King' - implies both attachment and claim. In the Sermon on the Mount, the idea of attachment is expressed in v. 48b, 'your heavenly Father is wholly consecrated', whereas the idea of claim is expressed in the Antitheses, 'but I say to you ...'. O. MICHEL seems to suggest that attachment and claim, or, in other words, dedication and obedience, are two aspects of the concept of perfection, when he says, referring to Mt xix.16, 21: 'The obedience to the commandments without perfection remains patchwork; only perfection makes from human morality true obedience to God. According to this synoptic report perfection consists in complete dedication and unreserved obedience.'<sup>1</sup> MICHEL is right as far as Mt xix. 16,21 is concerned. However, as we have seen, the concept of perfection is inserted here by the final redaction of Matthew.

With regard to the Sermon on the Mount, the problem of the relationship between attachment and claim, dedication and obedience, may be formulated in this way: What is the significance of the  $\sigma\hat{\upsilon}\nu$  in Mt v.48a? There is absolutely no doubt that it refers to the preceding context, linking the Antitheses and their conclusion together. But what exactly provides the link? 'In an unobtrusive but clear way', P. J. DU PLESSIS answers, ' $\sigma\hat{\upsilon}\nu$  refers to the immediately preceding vv. 43-47 for the key to unlock Christ's injunction  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\ \upsilon\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\iota$ . It recapitulates what these verses strive to teach and restates the message as a positive command.'<sup>2</sup>

This is to say, perfection in vs.48a must be understood as perfect love, or, in other words, 'as a totalitarian being  $\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta$ '.<sup>3</sup> The explanation added by DU PLESSIS, however, is not very convincing: 'One who loves friends and hates foes is without telos, he is not "whole". Love, if perfect, is so profound, radical, consistent that it includes one of the most difficult charges of self-abnegation: to love a personal enemy.'<sup>4</sup> DU PLESSIS seems to be influenced here by CH. C. TORREY, whom he quotes in another context.<sup>5</sup>

1 O. MICHEL, *Vollkommenheit* Heb. p. 343.

2 P. J. DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, p. 168.

3 *ibid.*, p. 170; cf. p. 173.

4 *ibid.*, p. 170/71.

5 See *ibid.*, p. 33; cf. also the interpretation suggested by A. M. HUNTER, *Design*, p. 58/59, which is like TORREY's.

In our opinion, TORREY is right not as to the first but as to the second part of his rather pointed statement, 'The trouble with this verse (sc. Mt v.48) lies not only in the absurd command to equal divine perfection, but also in the way in which it ignores, in effect, the preceding context, while professing to be based on it.'<sup>1</sup> This is to say, the term 'perfect' (τέλειος) in 48a ignores, or, in other words, is not linked to the sixth antithesis, i.e. to the commandment of unlimited love as such.

In order to find the exact point the οὐδὲν refers to, then, we must omit the sixth antithesis and examine the transition to vs. 48 more closely:

- (antithesis: vs. 44) - (three illustrations: cf. Lk vi.27,28)
- (45a) so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven;
- (positive statement: 45b)
- (46) For if you love those who love you,  
what reward have you?  
Do not even the tax collectors do the same?
- (47) And if you salute only your brethren,  
what more are you doing than others?  
Do not even the Gentiles do the same?
- (48) You, therefore, must be perfect,  
as your heavenly Father is perfect.

As we have seen above, the final redaction of Matthew used the 'more' in vs. 47 as a link with the editorial introduction to the Antitheses (cf. περισσόν - περισσεύσῃ, v.20).<sup>2</sup> As soon as we recognize the exact parallelism of the two verses 46 and 47, i.e. the transition proper, it is evident that this choice is rather arbitrary.<sup>3</sup> Using the emphatic 'You' (ὁμεῖς) as a clue, we propose the following link to be original: '... so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven' - this is to say, neither 'tax collectors' nor 'Gentiles' - 'you ... must be

1 CH C. TORREY, *Our Translated Gospels*, p. 96; the rest of the statement reads, "Be therefore perfect"; whereas the foregoing verse had enjoined imitation of God in showing kindness and good will to all men, even to enemies. "Be perfect in kindness" would be a suitable conclusion; but the Grk. adjective has its own definite meaning, and could not be interpreted in this way. The conjectured Aram. participle satisfies the sense, and explains the Grk."

2 See above pp.307,333.

3 This is to say, 'reward' in vs. 46 stands parallel to 'more' in vs.47, but it is not used for the creation of v.20.



perfect'. In short, the οὖν in 48a refers to vs. 45a:

ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς  
Ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ...

E. KLOSTERMANN comments on Mt v.45a, 'γένησθε does not by chance denote a gradual development (cf. Luke's καὶ ἔσεσθε - the other way round Mt 48).<sup>1</sup> But this does not imply that there is no difference between Matthew and Luke at this point. By interpolating 'and your reward will be great' in vs. 35, Luke defines the following καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ ὑψίστου in a futuristic sense.<sup>2</sup> Over against this, Matthew's γένησθε points to divine sonship as a possibility which can be realised here and now. How? A. M. HUNTER rightly says, 'In a human family, if a son honours and obeys his father, he realizes his sonship. If he dishonours and disrespects him, he repudiates his sonship. So it is in the family of God.'<sup>3</sup>

It could be argued that Mt v.45a - together with the positive statement vs 45b - concludes the sixth antithesis and thus is not in need of any further explanation. This is right to a certain extent. Of course, any answer to the question as to why Jesus added the conclusion vs.48 is conjectural. The addition becomes intelligible, however, as soon as we recognise the following topical sequence in the Sermon on the Mount: Perfection (v.8) - sonship (v.9) ---- sonship (v.45//Lk vi.35) - perfection (v.48; cf. Lk vi.36). This is to say, in Mt v.45-48 Jesus takes up again an important point made already in the Beatitudes, namely the relationship between perfection and sonship.

In Mt v.48a, Jesus reminds his disciples explicitly of what is implied in the sequence of the sixth and the seventh Beatitude: sonship presupposes the realization of perfection. Only he can be a son of his Father who is in heaven who is and remains wholly consecrated to Him, with his whole will and being. This is why we call the teaching of Jesus contained in the Antitheses the Way of perfection. For this is no secular morality which depends on

1 E. KLOSTERMANN, Mt. p. 50.

2 Cf. H. CONZELMANN, Luke, p. 234: 'When we turn to the reward for endurance, it is made quite clear that any claim, any reckoning as to one's desert is excluded (Luke vi.35; xvii.10).'

3 A. M. HUNTER, Design, p. 58.

human will alone but a 'cultic ethic', i.e. an ethic which depends on communio cum Deo. In other words, in the eschatological community God Himself has taken the direction in his hand; consequently, the members can only 'walk in His ways' if and as long as they are wholly turned to Him and accept His guidance. If this interpretation is correct, we may join vs. 45a and vs. 48a into one statement, in which the meaning of the  $\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$  is quite clear: 'You, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven, must be perfect.' This links up well with the interpretation of 48b advanced above.

W. P. DE BOER comments on Mt v. 48: 'The point of Jesus' argument here rests on the father-son relationship to which he calls attention in vs. 45. A son resembles his father. ... They (sc. the sons) are to bring their sonship to expression in their lives. They must find God to be their Father so really and so closely that his life sets the pattern for theirs and influences theirs.'<sup>1</sup> In our view, there is no interpretation so near and, at the same time, so far from being right, as that which finds in Mt v. 48 the idea of *imitatio Dei*. Where are the disciples supposed to find the pattern of God's life? How can God be the supreme Example for imitation for human beings? It is, of course, quite possible that a son may imitate his human father, but this is certainly not the vital point of human sonship. In the view of Jesus, the main characteristic of divine sonship is *obedience*, and that not in accordance with the pattern of God's life but in accordance with His will expressed in the Antitheses: 'But "I" say to you ...'. This point is made abundantly clear in the parable of the Hearers and Doers of the Word (Mt vii. 24-27 // Lk vi. 47-49), which doubtlessly closed the authentic Sermon on the Mount;<sup>2</sup> Obedience to the divine directions proclaimed through the mouth of Jesus is the 'rock' on which the eschatological community and the life of the individual disciples is built.

The emphasis of the closing parable on obedience suggests, moreover, that this idea is no part of the concept of perfection itself.<sup>3</sup> It goes without saying, that this is obvious from Mt v. 48b too. Perfection, then, consists - to use O. MICHEL's expressions<sup>4</sup> - in complete dedication to the

---

1 W.P. DE BOER, The Imitation of Paul, Kampen 1962, p. 71/72.

2 Once again, the version reported in Matthew obviously is more authentic than Luke's; cf. T. W. MANSON, Sayings, p. 61; A. M. HUNTER, Design, p. 91.

3 Of course, we cannot be certain as to how much of the material reported in Matthew between v. 48 and vii. 24 was part of the original Sermon; however, it is reasonable to think that the closing parable stood much nearer to v. 48 than in the present text.

4 See above p. 353.

heavenly Father which results in unreserved obedience. Or, as P. J. DU PLESSIS - referring both to Mt xix.21 and v.48 - puts it: 'Thus perfection as perfect love is a notion corresponding to the absolute attachment to God of the O.T. but only truly consummated and integrated by the teaching and the Person of Jesus Christ. Far from being a human or moral sentiment this perfection of love is the most fundamental description of the new vocation and life called into existence by faith and complete submission to His will.'<sup>1</sup> No objection can be raised against the paraphrase 'perfect love' for the Hebrew term 'tamim' in the religious or cultic sense of 'absolute attachment to God', as long as it is admitted to be a paraphrase. The reason why Jesus himself did not use the concept of love to express what he did in Mt v.48,<sup>2</sup> perhaps is the cultic background of the Sermon.

The best evidence for our thesis that the ethical aspect, i.e. obedience, is not present in the concept of perfection itself but rather its result, is found in Mt vii.16b-18:<sup>3</sup>

Are grapes gathered from thorns,  
or figs from thistles?<sup>4</sup>  
So, every sound tree bears good fruit,  
but the bad tree bears evil fruit.  
A sound tree cannot bear evil fruit,  
nor can a bad tree bear good fruit.

There is no doubt that the expression 'good fruit' denotes deeds in accordance with the will of God.

---

1 P. J. DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, p. 173.

2 In John's language, cf. especially Jn xv.1-17; 1 Jn iv. 7-12, Mt v.48 would read:  
You therefore must love God,  
for God loves you.

3 A comparison with Lk vi. 43-45 shows that the reference to the false prophets is editorial; we quote above what we believe to be the original saying.

4 Cf. T. W. MANSON, *Sayings*, p. 60: 'It is worth noting in favour of Mt. that the word translated "thorn" here is the word used in the LXX for the "wild grapes" of Is. 5.2,4; and also that the fruit of the thistle bears at least a faint resemblance to a fig. The plants mentioned are typical weeds (Gen 3.18, Hos. 10.8), from which no useful produce can be expected.' This is the clue for what follows: A 'sound tree' may be mistaken for a 'weed' or vice versa but the 'fruit' reveals the real identity.



The point here, then, is this: The quality of the disciples, i.e. their 'soundness' (cf.  $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\nu$ )<sup>1</sup>, determines their ethical conduct. Or, as Luther put it, 'It is not good works which make a good man, but a good man who does good works.'<sup>2</sup> In the words of Jesus:

You, therefore, must be  $\tau^e$ mymym (= whole, sound, entire),

as your heavenly Father is tamim (= whole, sound, entire).

Hence it follows that the translators of 'The New English Bible' do not convey the authentic meaning, when they render Mt v.48:

You must therefore be all goodness,

just as your heavenly Father is all good.<sup>3</sup>

We assume that the expression 'all goodness' is thought to refer to Mt v.20 - which, as we have seen above, is editorial - : '... unless you show yourselves far better man ...'.<sup>4</sup> This interpretation seems to be rejected also by R. G. SMITH, when he says, 'Nor do we find in the Bible any authority for speaking of perfection as the end-state of an ever-increasing goodness spreading through the individual or society.'<sup>5</sup>

Sonship, then, in the view of Jesus is more than perfection, i.e. wholeness of consecration to God (Mt v.48), purity in heart (v.8), for it is realised only in filial obedience. As a Father guides his sons, God directs his chosen people: 'You are the sons of the Lord your God; ... For you are a people holy to the Lord your God, and the Lord has chosen you to be a people for his own possession, out of all the peoples that are on the face of the earth. You shall not ... .. You may ... .. You shall ... .. that the Lord your God may bless you in all the work of your hands that you do' (Dt xiv. 1-29). This passage, which is unique for its directness in the Old Testament, receives a new

1 Note that in the LXX  $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\nu$  translates shalem in 1 Chr xxix.19: 'Grant to Solomon my son that with a whole heart (lebhabh shalem) he may keep thy commandments ...'.

2 Quoted from A. M. HUNTER, Design, p. 89.

3 Cf. also R. F. WEYMOUTH, The Modern Speech New Testament, London 1903, p. 14:  
You however are to be complete in goodness,  
as your heavenly Father is complete.

4 Cf. The Moffatt Translation of the Bible, which actually has 'goodness' in Mt v.20: '... unless your goodness excels ...'.

5 R. G. SMITH, art. cit. p. 167; SMITH links obedience by the following definition to the concept of perfection: 'Our obedience in faith is not the beginning of some vague progress on a shadowy moral way, but is the acceptance of grace, which is always whole, complete, perfect; and in the strength of this encounter our life is lived.' (ibid.)

emphasis on the cosmic mountain: the choice of the eschatological community is no more, so to speak, 'out of the world' but 'for the world'. The disciples are the representatives of the 'many peoples' who shall come and say,

Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord,  
to the house of the God of Jacob;  
that he may teach us his ways  
and that we may walk in his paths (Is ii.3a).

Looking back on the cultic interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount advanced in the previous and the present chapter, we are now able to recognise the essential character of the way(s) that God taught on the mountain in Galilee through the mouth of Jesus: it is THE WAY OF THE SON.<sup>1</sup> Three things are implied in this statement, namely (1) initiation into the kingdom of heaven in the deepest sense is to be understood as a divine adoption (cf. Mt v.9)<sup>2</sup>; (2) all ethical teaching given to the eschatological community - thus not only the sixth antithesis - is intended to serve the same purpose, viz., 'so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven' (v.45); (3) the authentic teaching on the mountain ultimately must be understood Christologically.

The last point will appear a surprising conclusion, which needs some justification. The thesis that the Sermon on the Mount must be understood Christologically has been advanced especially by EDUARD THURNEYSEN<sup>3</sup> and DIETRICH BONHOEFFER<sup>4</sup>. The vital question is, of course, what kind of Christology? BONHOEFFER's comment on Mt v.47,48 may be quoted in order to show the basis difference between the 'Christological' and the 'cultic' approach to the Sermon: 'What is the  $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \acute{o} \nu$  ? It is the love of Jesus himself, who went patiently and obediently to the cross - it is in fact the cross itself. ... In Christ crucified and his people the "extraordinary" becomes reality. - These men are perfect, the men in whom the undivided love of the heavenly Father is perfected. It was that love which gave the Son to die for us upon the cross, and it is by

1 The capitals allow the term 'SON' to be ambiguous in the sense of 'The Son', i.e. Jesus, and 'the son(s)', i.e. his disciples. Cf. the similar expression 'The Way of Sonship' used by E. J. TINSLEY, *Imitation*, e.g., p. 69, which, however, is understood differently: 'Jesus was himself the "Way", and therefore the perfect imitator of the Father.' (ibid., p. 72)

2 See above p. 266.

3 E. THURNEYSEN, *Die Bergpredigt*, Theol. Existenz Heute, Neue Folge Nr 105, (1st ed. 1936) 5th ed. revised, München 1963.

4 D. BONHOEFFER, *The Cost of Discipleship*; (cf. above p. 276)

suffering in the fellowship of this cross that the followers of Jesus are perfected. The perfect are none other than the blessed of the beatitudes.<sup>1</sup>

The difference between the 'Christological' and the 'cultic' approach to the Sermon may be defined as follows: whereas the former focuses attention on the person of Christ, the latter starts with his message which - as we have tried to show - is patterned after the temple cult. There is no doubt that H. WINDISCH would have denounced BONHOEFFER's interpretation as a typical example of 'a confusion of historical and theological exegesis of the Bible.'<sup>2</sup> The fact that BONHOEFFER interprets the 'more' in Mt v.47 and 'perfection' in vs. 48 in the light of the cross suggests that he 'telescopes' the Way of the Son, or, in other words, that he puts the cross first.<sup>3</sup> Thus - either consciously or unconsciously - BONHOEFFER seems to reinterpret the Sermon on the Mount in accordance with Paul's Christology, which does less than justice to its original meaning.<sup>4</sup>

- 
- 1 D. BONHOEFFER, *ibid.*, p. 137/38; E. THURNEISEN, *ibid.*, p. 22, mentions Mt v.48 in passing only: 'Thus e.g. v.48: "you will be perfect ..." (paraphrase: you will be turned to the goals, which are God's goals).' By this THURNEISEN means that this saying is an example of the 'future tense of promise' in the Sermon.
  - 2 Cf. H. WINDISCH, *Meaning*, p. 128: 'There is obviously no place within the framework of the Sermon on the Mount for the cross or the Spirit.'
  - 3 Cf. also D. BONHOEFFER, *ibid.*, p. 79: 'As we embark upon discipleship we surrender ourselves to Christ in union with his death - we give our lives to death. Thus it begins; the cross is not the terrible end to an otherwise god-fearing and happy life, but it meets us at the beginning of our communion with Christ. When Christ calls a man, he bids him come and die.' See also E. THURNEISEN *ibid.*, p. 20: '... via Christ, only via Christ, we can justly say via crucis, only via his cross we are, what we are, children of the kingdom.' - Our point is not unlike that made by W. MARXSEN, *Erwägungen zum Problem des verkündigten Kreuzes*, in: *NTS*, Vol. VIII, 1961-62, esp. p.214: 'For, in my opinion, the point is that one has to keep one's eye on the direction of the statements but does not interchange them in secret. I hold at any rate the opinion that it is a mortal sin of theological work to use statements which originated in one direction in the opposite direction.' MARXSEN's point here is that one may not interpret the (historical) cross in the light of Easter. We use above a similar argument for the sequence Sermon - cross.
  - 4 Cf. especially 1 Cor ii.2. From the cit. above n.3 we get the impression that BONHOEFFER has Paul's doctrine of baptism in mind, which we may sum up in this sentence: We have been baptized into Christ's death (cf. Rom vi.3) and circumcised in his circumcision (Col ii.11). THURNEISEN's tendency is similar; cf. esp. op. cit., pp.14ff; on p. 25 he calls the Pauline concept of 'righteousness' the 'primary apostolic interpretation' of the Sermon. This implies that he bases his interpretation mainly on the editorial passage Mt v.17-20 (cf. *ibid.*, p. 26), and thus his interpretation is secondary, namely from the point of view of Jesus himself. Of course, we only criticise the method of Christological approach, and not its theological results.



It is obvious that the Sermon on the Mount does not present us with a developed Christology at all but at most with some raw material. The choice of the raw material suggested by the cultic interpretation is the concept of divine sonship which occurs in Mt v.8 and v.45. However, it is of first importance to realise that Jesus nowhere explicitly speaks about himself in the Sermon, that he neither reveals himself as the Son nor defines the relationship between the 'sons' and himself.

On the whole we may say that the Christology of the Fourth Gospel is nearer to that implied in the Sermon than Paul's, in that the former gives the central position to the concept of divine sonship. 'John agrees with Paul', E. SCHWEIZER says, 'that the Christ-event represents God's victory in the great cosmic struggle between God and the world, because it is a proof of the righteousness of God and the unrighteousness of the world. But John does not give the central position to the cross as an atonement or substitution; his main emphasis is on the incarnation and obedience of Jesus, even to the Cross. In his Gospel the concept of time is even more relative. For it is precisely in the Son's absolute obedience, consummated in the complete humiliation of the Cross, that his oneness with the Father is revealed. This is God's message to the world, the revelation of His glory, the pledge of His love to the world. Anyone who comes to the faith perceives God Himself - in the incarnate Christ.'<sup>1</sup>

The main development between the implicit Christology of the Sermon on the Mount and John's Christology apparently is that the latter restates the content of divine sonship by means of his description of Jesus as the eternal 'Logos' who was related to the world through His 'incarnation' (cf. Jn i.1f., 14).<sup>2</sup> Before leaving John, let us glance briefly at his definition of the relationship between the Son and the sons. It is well known that he uses the peculiar expressions 'the only Son from

---

1 E. SCHWEIZER, The Concept of the Church in the Gospel and Epistles of St. John, in: NT Essays, (ed. A. J. B. HIGGINS), p. 237.

2 On John's Christology see C. K. BARRETT, The Gospel according to St. John, An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text, (reprinted), London 1956, pp. 58 ff., and A. RICHARDSON, Theology, p. 152f.

the Father' (μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, i.14; cf. i.18, iii.16,18; 1 Jn iv.9), and the 'children of God ... who were born ... of God' (τέκνα θεοῦ... ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγενήθησαν, i.12,13). This definition, which reserves the term υἱός for Jesus, distinguishes sharply between Christ and the Christians. 'For John', C. K. BARRETT remarks, 'Jesus' sonship does indeed involve a metaphysical relationship with the Father. ... But these notions are always qualified by the thought of a fundamentally moral relationship, in which the Son is obedient to the Father. ... By thus showing its two aspects John brings out more clearly than the synoptists the meaning of sonship: both moral likeness and essential identity are included.'<sup>1</sup> As far as we can see, the second aspect is not present in the Johannine designation 'children' as used for the disciples. The underlying idea perhaps is that of 'adoption' (υἱοθεσία),<sup>2</sup> or, in John's own terminology, 'we are sons by the ἐξουσία which Christ gives to us (John 1.12).'<sup>3</sup> Although John's emphasis on obedience is evident in the whole Gospel, it cannot be denied that the designation 'children' - and even more 'little children' (τεκνία, 1 Jn ii.1,12 and often) - tends to endanger the responsibility of the Christian in the world: it is symptomatic, e.g., that he is no longer exhorted to love his enemies.<sup>4</sup>

In this connection it is interesting to examine the passage Mt xi. 25-30 // Lk x.21-22, for it - or, more exactly, Mt xi.27 par. - has been described as 'a Johannine thunderbolt in the Synoptic

1 Cf. C. K. BARRETT, *ibid.*, p. 60.

2 This actually is the conception by means of which Paul defines the relationship between the Son and the Sons; Christ is the Son of God, the Christians are the 'adopted' sons of God (cf. Rom viii.15,23; ix.4; Gal iv.5; and also Eph i.5). However, John's expression in i.13 points to the Semitic equivalent of υἱοθεσία, namely (re-)begetting (See A. RICHARDSON, *ibid.*, p. 264, and above p.123,n1).

3 A. RICHARDSON, *ibid.*, p. 152/53.

4 On this see E. SCHWEIZER, *art. cit.* p. 237f.; it is worth noting that Paul, while he uses νήπιος together with υἱός, in Gal iv. iff. clearly distinguishes between the status of a child and a son: the characteristics of the latter are freedom, maturity, knowledge of God, and that through the Son. Furthermore, in 1 Cor xiii.8-13 and xiv.20 Paul links the ideas of knowledge and maturity with the concept of perfection: 'Brethren, do not be children in your thinking; be babes in evil, but in thinking be mature' (τέλειοι γίνεσθε, xiv.20). For an interpretation of these two passages see B. RIGAUX, *Perfection*, (see above p. 8, n.2), p. 251f., and P. J. DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, pp.185ff.

sly'.<sup>1</sup> R. H. FULLER insists that the authenticity of this passage 'is so much in doubt that we cannot use it to prove anything'.<sup>2</sup> As it contains the concept of divine sonship, however, we may expect it to shed some light on Jesus' view of the relationship between the Son and the sons, which he left undefined in the Sermon on the Mount. The first question to be considered is, Did Jesus actually apply the term 'the Son (of God)' to himself? In view of Mt v.9,45 we would be surprised if he did not do this. A. RICHARDSON points to another piece of evidence in saying, 'The use of abba makes it difficult to deny that Jesus thought of himself as uniquely God's Son or to suppose that the Church derived the idea of his Sonship from any other source than Jesus himself'.<sup>3</sup>

At first glance, the fact that mention is made in Mt xi.25-27 par. of 'the Son' and 'babes' ( *νηπιόεις* ) could be held to point in the direction of John's differentiation between 'the Son' and 'the children'. There is indeed no doubt that the term 'babes' denotes the disciples.<sup>4</sup> After Mt v.9,45 it is quite improbable that it was used in the most obvious sense of 'the spiritually immature'. Our conjecture is that we have to do here with an allusion to Jeremiah's prophecy of the New Covenant, Jer. xxxi.31-34.<sup>5</sup> This is to say, the 'babes' refer to 'the least' (MT: *miq' ṭannam*, LXX: *μικροῦ*), and 'the wise and understanding' to 'the greatest' (MT: *g' dholam*, LXX: *μεγάλου*). The emphasis, then, is not so much on the exact definition of the two groups but rather on the sequence of the beginning fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy: from the 'babes' to the 'wise and understanding' (*σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν*). The opening formula certainly is in accordance with the tenor of fulfilment implied in the allusion to Jer xxxi, and the last line of the first strophe explicitly states that this fulfilment reflects the gracious purpose of the heavenly Father:

1 A. RICHARDSON, *Theology*, p. 43; cf. R. H. FULLER, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus*, London 1954, pp. 84, and 89ff.; A. M. HUNTER, *Crux Criticorum - Matt. xi.25-30 - A Re-Appraisal*, in: *NTS*, Vol. 8, 1961-62, pp. 245ff.; and T. ARVEDSON, *Das Mysterium Christi. Eine Studie zu Mt 11.25-30*, Leipzig-Uppsala 1937.

2 R. H. FULLER, *ibid.*, p. 84; cf. R. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, p. 159/60.

3 A. RICHARDSON, *ibid.*, p. 149; cf. also RICHARDSON's criticism of BULTMANN's interpretation of Mt xi.27, *ibid.*, p. 43.

4 So also A. M. HUNTER, *ibid.*, p. 243; cf. also T. ARVEDSON, *ibid.*, p. 156 (as a suggestion, referring to Mt xviii.7).

5 See above p. 316, n.3; for other alternatives cf. T. ARVEDSON, *ibid.*, p. 156. Of course, we cannot be certain in this question.



STROPHE I: I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth,  
 that thou hast hidden these things  
 from the wise and understanding  
 and revealed them to babes;  
 yea, Father, for such was thy gracious will. (25-26)

A similar thought is expressed in Mk iv. 11 // Mt xiii. 11 // Lk viii. 10:

To you has been given the secret(s)<sup>1</sup> of the kingdom of God,  
 but for those outside everything is in parables.

If the two statements Mk iv. 11 par. and Mt xi. 25 par. - as far as they refer to the disciples - may be regarded as parallels, it is reasonable to think that the expression 'these things' ( ταῦτα ) in the latter points to the same things as 'the secrets of the kingdom of God'.<sup>2</sup> What is meant, then? The title of our present section suggests the answer: the reference is to 'the secrets of the Way of Jesus', especially to the secret to be revealed last of all, namely the identity of Jesus himself. Thus, the fact that in the second strophe Jesus explicitly calls himself 'the Son' provides an excellent link between the two strophes.<sup>3</sup>

II All things have been delivered to me by my Father,  
 and no one knows the Son except the Father,  
 and no one knows the Father except the Son  
 and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him. (27)

What is the origin of the title 'the Son'? It is quite probable that it recalls Peter's Confession,

'You are the anointed, the Son of the living God' ( δὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, Mt xvi.

15).<sup>4</sup> This would imply that there is no question here of Jesus' claiming this title. In fact, the first line points in a similar direction. R. H. FULLER says, 'The aorist tense παρεδόθη, "were delivered",

1 Over against Mk's singular ( μυστήριον ), which seems to refer to the so-called 'Messianic secret', we hold Mt's and Lk's plural to be authentic.

2 Cf. A. M. HUNTER, *ibid.*, p. 243: 'In any case, ταῦτα must refer, in one way or other, to the secret of the presence of the kingdom which was the burden of Jesus' preaching' (without ref. to Mk iv. 11 par.)

3 So also A. M. HUNTER, *ibid.*, p. 243, with different arguments.

4 As far as we can see, J. KLAUSNER was first to suggest that Jesus uttered Mt xi. 25f. after Peter's Confession; see above p. 224/25. Cf. also A. M. HUNTER, *ibid.*, p. 243.

requires a specific event between the Father and the Son', and suggests that 'it refers to the Baptism of Jesus, in which case it may be taken as a saying of the historical Jesus.'<sup>1</sup> As we have seen above,<sup>2</sup> the oldest Jesus tradition interprets his baptism by means of a divine decree, which is in accordance with the 'anointment oracle' in Ps ii, 7. Matthew's version of Peter's Confession also contains a reference to Ps ii in that the title 'the Son' is preceded by 'the Anointed' (ὁ χριστός, Heb. M<sup>e</sup>shiah, cf. Ps ii, 2). Thus the oldest tradition is quite clear on this point; far from being his own claim, the sonship of Jesus is grounded in the will of the heavenly Father.

Did Jesus himself tell his disciples of the 'decree of the Lord' which revealed to him his divine Sonship on the day of his baptism? We may take Jesus' words, 'and no one knows the Son except the Father' for an answer. A. M. HUNTER is right in saying, 'Here of course we are in the realm of ultimate mystery. The secret of the Father remains with the Son alone. No man knew, or knows, why the Father chose Jesus of Nazareth.'<sup>3</sup> At any rate, Mt xvi, 17 suggests that Jesus did not tell his disciples anything about his own identity before Peter's Confession. Mt xi, 25-27 par., then, perhaps is Jesus' confirmation of Peter's Confession in the form of a thanksgiving to the Father, while the Transfiguration may be interpreted as the confirmation of the Father himself.<sup>4</sup>

Although the 'why' of Jesus' choice is and remains a secret and although we cannot be certain about the 'when', this does not imply that we are left in the dark also concerning the meaning of the emphatic πάντα in vs. 27. First, 'all things' certainly include 'these things' mentioned in vs. 25, i.e. the 'secrets of the kingdom' revealed in the teaching and life of Jesus. Second, it is reasonable to think that the expression 'all things' denotes more than 'these things', and that in the sense of his mission as a whole.<sup>5</sup> We may assume that Jesus meant to define his mission simply by confirming that

---

1 R. H. FULLER, *Mission*, p. 91; the possibility mentioned first is, 'it refers to the exaltation of Jesus after his death (cf. ἐξόρθη μοι πάντα ἐξουσία, Matt. 28, 18), ...'

2 See above p. 203.

3 A. M. HUNTER, *ibid.*, p. 246.

4 See above p. 232ff.

5 Cf. R. H. FULLER, *ibid.*, p. 91: 'In that case the πάντα will be the Reign of God which Jesus is to proclaim and inaugurate by fulfilling the mission of the Servant.'

he is 'the Son'. The Son - according to the conception of divine kingship<sup>1</sup> - is the representative of God before the people and the representative of the people before God. In other words, Jesus is the Son and the Servant.

In Mt xi.27 Jesus defines his mission further by the concept of 'knowledge'. It has been recognised before that the Greek verb ἐπιγινώσκει used in the second and third line must be understood in the sense of the Hebrew verb yadha',<sup>2</sup> and thus that the Old Testament concept of da'at Elohim 'supplies the likeliest background to the supreme "I-thou" relationship of Matt. xi.27'.<sup>3</sup> Again our suggestion is that the original reference is to Jer xxxi.34, and that to the expression '... for they all shall know me' (yedh'u 'othi).<sup>4</sup> The theme of this strophe, then, is the eschatological 'knowledge', or, communion with God. In A. M. HUNTER's words, 'What is meant here is not theological learning but a personal "I-thou" relationship engaging heart and mind and will - a relationship initiated and sustained by the Father, and completed and fulfilled by Jesus' own filial response of obedience and love - a response writ large in the Gospel record from the Wilderness to Gethsemane. If "communion with God" is our best English equivalent, we must interpret that communion, as the Old Testament does, in an existential and ethical way.'<sup>5</sup>

The mission of the Son, then, is the communication of the communion with God. We realise now that it is just this that Jesus is doing on the mountain in Galilee. In fact, Mt v.48 and Mt xi.27 in essence are identical: 'perfection' means to be wholly

1 See above pp. 110ff.

2 Cf. R. H. FULLER, *ibid.*, p. 92.

3 A. M. HUNTER, *ibid.*, p. 245; the following sentence reads, 'On this issue recent scholars (Schniewind, T. W. Manson, Taylor, Bieneck, Dupont, Fuller, etc.) speak almost with one voice.'

4 Cf. R. H. FULLER, *ibid.*, p. 93: 'Hence the knowledge of God is eventually relegated to the eschatological hope (Jer. 31.34). It is this eschatological knowledge which Jesus, as the Son, enjoys, and which he is through his proclamation and activity revealing to other men, as the fourth clause of the verse asserts:'. FULLER's following paragraph shows that he does not quite mean the same as we do; cf. this sentence: 'The "knowledge", then, which Jesus mediates, is the proclamation of the impending advent of the eschatological Reign of God, in which the powers of that Reign are already proleptically at work in him.'

5 A. M. HUNTER, *ibid.*, p. 246.



consecrated to the Father, as the Father is wholly consecrated to 'you', i.e. the 'sons' (v.45); 'knowledge' of the Father implies filial relationship and presupposes choice and communion of the Father with the Son. It is quite probable that Jesus consciously refers to the Sermon on the Mount in the last line of Mt xi.27, 'and any one to whom the Son chooses (  $\beta ο υ λ η τ α ι$  ) to reveal him'. At the same time, these words make clear that Jesus' statement about 'the Son' is inclusive rather than 'exclusive'<sup>1</sup>: The disciples, i.e. the 'babes' who are said to be the object of divine revelation in the first strophe, doubtless at present already participate in the knowledge of, or, in the communion with the Father, and, consequently, in the sonship of Jesus.

At this point, we may recall again Jeremiah's prophecy, '... for they shall all know me ...' (xxxi.34). How shall all know Yahweh? Or, relating the question to Mt xi.27 and the Sermon, How did Jesus transfer his 'knowledge' of the Father to his disciples? The answer is: Mainly by imparting torah//  $\delta ι δ α χ η$  // teaching, and that - in a form recalling the Temple cult - in the Name of Yahweh (cf. Jer xxxi.33, Is ii.3).<sup>2</sup> This is confirmed by the third strophe of Mt xi.25f., which is omitted by Luke:<sup>3</sup>

1 Cf. A. M. HUNTER, Cruz, p. 245; HUNTER seems to overlook Ps. ii.7.

2 See however A. M. HUNTER, *ibid.*, p. 246: 'If the Son knows the Father with the same knowledge as the Father has of himself, it is not a knowledge which is transferable. The power Christ claims to give is not the power to know the Father as he did, but rather the power to know the Father in him.' Cf. also HEINZ ZAHN, The Historical Jesus, (ET) London 1963, p.144: 'In his Sonship, Jesus restores our lost sonship. He does it not by imparting teaching, not through cult and sacrifice, not through an act of supernatural magic, but through a personal, historical human life. Jesus, the man from Nazareth, in allowing God to be his Father, shows himself to be the son. And in showing himself to be the Son he shows God to be the Father. Thus the Sonship of Jesus reveals the Fatherhood of God: the Father knows the Son and the Son knows the Father.' - Our cultic interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount shows that it is not enough to say that the disciples know the Father in Jesus. The medium of Jesus is the word, but - and this is what we mean by 'mainly' - the communion with the Father is always dependent on His 'coming' in the midst of the disciples.

3 Luke probably knew that 'the rabbis spoke of the yoke of the Law' (OAB, ad loc.) Hence the reason for his omitting the third strophe may be sought in his strict scheme of redemptive history: 'The law and the prophets were until John; since then the good news of the kingdom of God is preached, ...' (xvi.16; cf. Mt xi.12). Hence it follows - for Luke - that Jesus' mission was to preach (iv.43; cf. Mk i.38). On the question of Luke and the law see H. CONZELMANN, Luke, pp. 159ff.

III Come to me, all who labor and are heavy laden,  
 and I will give you rest.  
 Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me,  
 for I am gentle and lowly in heart,  
 and you will find rest for your souls,  
 for my yoke is easy, and my burden is light. (28-30)

What Jesus means in vs.28 is evident from Mt xxiii. lff.: the teaching of the scribes and Pharisees is compared with 'heavy burdens' (φορτία βαρέα) which they lay on men's shoulders. Furthermore, in xxiii.8 Jesus describes himself as the one teacher (εἷς ... δὲ διδάσκαλος) of his disciples. Hence, the meaning of vs.29a is quite clear: those who come to him in order to become his disciples (μαθηταίς), have to take his 'yoke' (ζυγόν), i.e. his teaching, upon their shoulders and learn (μάθετε) from him.<sup>1</sup> It is well known that the yoke metaphor stems from the Old Testament (cf. Jer ii.20, v.5, and also Ps ii.3, Zeph iii.9).<sup>2</sup> Jer v.4-5 is of special interest for the understanding of Mt xi. 28-29, because it contains a contrast similar to that in Jer xxxi.34 and Mt xi.25: "Then I said,

"These are only the poor, they have no sense;  
 for they do not know the way of the Lord,  
 and the law (mishppat) of their God."  
 I will go to the great, and will speak to them;  
 for they know the way of the Lord,  
 and the law (mishppat) of their God,"  
 But they all alike had broken the yoke (ó'1),  
 they had burst the bonds.<sup>3</sup>

1 Cf. however T.W.MANSON, *Sayings*, p.186: 'This learning is not merely receiving instruction, even such instruction as is conveyed in the Sermon on the Mount: it is learning from the example of Jesus Himself how to serve God and man in love.' MANSON's ref. to his *Teaching*, shows that he is thinking of the idea of imitation (cf. *Teaching*, p.240). With W.MICHAELIS, art. mimeomai, in: *TWNT IV*, we hold that this is a Rabbinic idea which is foreign to the OT (ibid., p.665, cf.n.7). The line 'for I am gentle and lowly in heart' describes Jesus' attitude towards his disciples: he is helpful as a teacher, in contrast to the scribes and Pharisees who 'themselves will not move them (sc. the heavy burdens they lay on the shoulders of their disciples) with their finger.' Note, furthermore, that the term *πραῦς* is contained earlier in the third Beatitude.

2 Cf. J.B.BAUER, *Das milde Joch und die Ruhe*, Matth. 11.28-30, in: *TZ*, Jahrg. 17, Heft 2, März-April 1961, pp.99/100.

3 Note the parallelism of the expressions 'the way of the Lord'/'the law of their God'/'the yoke'/'the bonds'.

The yoke of Jesus is 'easy' not because its demands are lower (cf. Antitheses) but because it is the yoke, or, **THE WAY OF THE SON**. This implies two things: (1) Jesus, the Son, himself bears the yoke and thus leads the way; (2) the sons are the object of the Father's love and care (cf. Mt vi.25-32) and participate in His enabling power (cf. Mt x.19-20).

We now come to the question: Does the finding that the disciples participate in the sonship of Jesus imply that they participate in his mission as well? This is suggested also by the following four observations we have made earlier, namely: (a) The Sending Out of the Twelve signifies that the disciples share in Jesus' task to gather the people of Israel unto the Lord.<sup>1</sup> (b) The concept of the Son / Servant of God is connected with the idea of 'representation'. According to the ideal development originally conceived by Jesus, the Sermon on the Mount belongs to the stage of the 'few' who are to represent the 'many', i.e. Israel in the first place.<sup>2</sup> (c) Jesus' speaking about the suffering of the Son of Man implies that he together with his disciples should be the remnant that saves by service and self-sacrifice.<sup>3</sup> (d) Finally, the first Beatitude promises a share in God's kingship to the initiated.<sup>4</sup> Hence we may assume that the question mentioned above must be answered in the affirmative.

If, then, the Sermon on the Mount in Jesus' own view is connected with his conception of a collective mission, its original purpose is not only the initiation of the disciples into the communion with the Father, but also to prepare the eschatological community, or ultimately Israel as a whole, for her mediatorial function at the time of Yahweh's final manifestation, through which he will bring the nations into communion with Himself.<sup>5</sup> (1) to proclaim Yahweh's kingship over the earth, (2) to announce the divine conditions of admission to His Temple, and (3) to teach the nations His Ways; in short, to be the priest of Yahweh. We may assume that the 'rest' (  $\alpha^2 \nu \acute{\alpha} \pi \alpha \upsilon \sigma \epsilon \iota \varsigma$  ) Jesus promises in Mt xi.29 ultimately points to the impending consummation of the kingdom of heaven, when all the earth will be obedient to the will of the Father (cf. Mt vi.10).

---

1 See above p.213.

2 See above p.229.

3 See above p.231f.

4 See above p.270/71.

5 Cf. R.MARTIN-ACHARD, op.cit., p.75.



According to the basic structure of the temple cult,<sup>1</sup> the end of Mt v seems to be the end of the authentic Sermon. Even the sayings in Mt vi-vii that have parallels in Luke and thus were contained in the common catechetical source,<sup>2</sup> do not seem to be fitted into a specific order. However, we may recall that the temple cult ends in an 'all-embracing blessing of the priest on the congregation.'<sup>3</sup> Does the Sermon have a similar ending? The only passage which suggests itself for this place in Mt vii.24-27 par., which closes the Sermon both in Matthew and in Luke. Is the duplication of the parable meant to recall the blessing and curse which end the conclusion or renewal of a covenant in the Old Testament and at Qumran?<sup>4</sup> In this case, the 'wise man' would be the blessed man and the 'foolish man' the cursed one. At any rate, if we take Mt xvi.18 into account,<sup>5</sup> it is reasonable to think that the 'wise man who built his house upon the rock' depicts the member of the eschatological community who participates in the mission of Jesus, namely: the building of the spiritual 'House' or 'Temple'. Thus the passage Mt vii.24-27 is 'all-embracing' in that it explains in the form of a parable what Jesus has been doing on the Mount of the Sermon, namely he has been laying the foundation of the 'New (or restored) Temple' on the rock of obedience, which will serve as a stable foundation in the days of persecution which are to come (cf. the Eighth Beatitude)<sup>6</sup>:

Every one then who hears  
     these words of mine and does them,  
 will be like a wise man  
     who built his house upon the rock;  
 and the rain fell, and the floods came,  
     and the winds blew and beat upon the house,  
 but it did not fall  
     because it had been founded on the rock.  
 And every one who hears  
     these words of mine and does not do them,  
 will be like a foolish man

---

1 See above p.175.

2 See above pp.42ff.

3 See above p.175.

4 See above p.187.

5 Cf. above pp.227, 230.

6 See above p.295/96.

who built his house upon the sand;  
 and the rain fell, and the floods came,  
 and the wind blew and beat against that house,  
 and it fell -  
 and the ruin of the house was great. (Mt vii.24-27)

It is probable, then, that by this parable Jesus concluded the Sermon on the Mount. Of course, this is not to say that the other passages in Mt vi-vii are not authentic. To a great extent they certainly are. Moreover, they are connected with the Sermon in that they are addressed to the eschatological community too. It is most probably for this reason that they were added to the Sermon, perhaps to a certain extent already by its first compiler.<sup>1</sup> In our opinion Mt vi. -vii par. (except vii.24-27) contains materials which originally belonged to Jesus' private teaching to his disciples between the Sermon and Peter's Confession.

The fact that the two chapters Mt vi-vii - except the final parable - do not seem to fit into the authentic Sermon according to the cultic interpretation advanced in our chapters VII and VIII does not speak against the validity of this interpretation. On the contrary: If the so-called 'Sermon' on the Mount actually was a historical event that happened during the ministry of Jesus in Galilee on a geographical mountain, and thus necessarily on a certain day, the 'size' of the 'Sermon' must be accordingly. It would be difficult to deny that the sayings which we assume to be part of the authentic 'Sermon' i.e., roughly Mt v.3-10, 13-16, 21-24, 27-48; vii.24-27, taken together in size are adequate as the festal liturgy for the inauguration of the kingdom of heaven.<sup>2</sup>

Before we draw some final conclusions concerning 'perfection' in the context of this festal liturgy, we first turn briefly to the Letter to the Hebrews, since in this Letter the concept of perfection is central,<sup>3</sup> and it explicitly speaks about the perfection of the Son and the perfection of the sons.

---

<sup>1</sup> See above p.46.

<sup>2</sup> This, then, is our definition of the authentic 'Sermon' on the Mount; of course we are not going to propose a change of the old-established name. Cf. the conclusion W.D.DAVIES arrived at, Setting, p.435; we prefer our formulation to the notion of a renewal of the Covenant, or New Covenant, because this term is not found in the Sermon.

<sup>3</sup> So O.MICHEL, Vollkommenheit Heb. p.333.

## IX

### THE CONCEPT OF PERFECTION IN

#### THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS

##### 1 The evidence of the letter to the Hebrews

The unknown author of the Letter to the Hebrews uses the adjective  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$  twice in his treatise (v.14; ix.11), the verb  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon$  nine times (ii.10; v.9; vii.19,28; ix.9; x.1,14; xi.40; xii.23), once the nouns  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma$  (vi.1),  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$  (vii.11) and  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma$  (xii.2), and furthermore five times the noun  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  (iii.6,14; vi.8,11; vii.3). The occurrence of the whole Greek word-group suggests that  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$  is used with a Greek meaning rather than in the sense of the Hebrew terms *tamim* or *shalem*. However, O. MICHEL says in his essay quoted already in our previous chapter, 'The New Testament message of perfection in the Letter to the Hebrews assumes cultic forms.' 'Let us try', he proceeds, 'to describe the cultic form exactly: God's commandment determines the perfection of a priest, of a sacrifice, of the congregation. The story of Jesus is nothing else but the fulfilment of a certain cultic presupposition: only in this way atonement is possible. Gethsemane and Golgotha are necessary stages on this way. This cultic form of perfection also derives from the Old Testament; to look for its origin elsewhere at least would be artificial. That perfection is tied up with a concrete event however is exclusively biblical; cross and exaltation are Jesus' goal, are the atonement of the congregation.'<sup>1</sup>

MICHEL's statement encourages us to look for reminiscences of the - according to our interpretation cultic - concept of perfection in the context of the Sermon on the Mount in the Letter to the Hebrews. Such reminiscences, if they could be found, might be regarded as external evidence which

---

<sup>1</sup> O. MICHEL, Vollkommenheit Heb., p.350.



supports our interpretation of Mt v.48. It is clear that this evidence would be of special interest if the date of composition of the Letter is earlier than that of the Gospel of Matthew. In the following passage T.HENSHAW shows that this is probable: 'At first sight the absence of any reference to the destruction of the Temple in the section in which the author is proving the temporary character of the Jewish rites, would seem to suggest that the Temple was still standing. Against this it is commonly argued that the author's references to the Levitical rites are taken entirely from the Old Testament, and show no familiarity with the worship of the actual Temple in Jerusalem. But, even if he had never been present at the Temple worship, he could not have entirely dissociated it from its Old Testament origin; and the actual disappearance of the Levitical rites would have been so strong a confirmation of his argument that they had been intended to be temporary, that it is hard to believe he would not have used it if, in fact, they had disappeared. Thus a date after the death of Paul and Peter and after the Neronian persecution, but before the destruction of Jerusalem, becomes probable but not certain.'<sup>1</sup>

As in the Letter to the Hebrews we have to do with 'a careful and closely knit discussion',<sup>2</sup> we cannot isolate its concept of perfection from the other themes. Of course, an appropriate discussion of the various interpretations advanced concerning this Letter or an attempt at an original interpretation would exceed the limits of the present study.<sup>3</sup> What we may do here is to survey briefly the themes of the Letter, in order to understand 'perfection' in the light of the whole and, if possible, to find reminiscences of other points of the teaching of Jesus.<sup>4</sup>

We have already quoted the beginning of the prologue i.1-4, in connection with the 'I' of the Antitheses.<sup>5</sup> The statement about Jesus in this passage, namely that he is 'a Son', is in accordance with the Christology implied in the Sermon on the Mount. In the prologue Jesus' sonship implies that he is prophet, priest and king. Among the seven quotations from the Old Testament in i.5-13

---

1 T.HENSHAW, New Testament Literature, (Paperback ed.) London 1963, p.342.

2 OAB, introduction to the Letter.

3 See, e.g., RGG III, art, Hebräerbrief, coll.106ff.

4 To the following survey cf. the notes of the OAB.

5 See above p.315.

we note especially those from the royal psalms Pss ii.7 and cx.1. These quotations are meant to show the superiority of the Son to the angels. The emphasis on hearing of and obedience to the message of the Lord (= Jesus) over against the 'message declared by angels', i.e. the law of Moses (cf. Acts vii.53; Gal iii.19), in the exhortation ii.1-4 reminds us of Mt vii.24-27 and the Antitheses, ii.5-18: In his suffering Jesus 'for a little while was made lower than the angels' (vs.9), 'made like his brethren in every respect, so that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God' (vs.17, cf.18). As soon as we understand the title 'Son of God' against the background of the ancient concept of divine kingship, it is not surprising that the author ascribes priestly power to the (royal) Son.<sup>1</sup> In chapter ii, where the author speaks about the suffering of Jesus, the characteristic expression 'to make perfect' (τελειῶσαι, vs.10) occurs for the first time.

In iii.1 we find the significant word δμολογίας, i.e. 'confession' (cf. iv.14, κρατῶμεν τῆς δμολογίας; x.23, κατέχουμεν τὴν δμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος). 'The δμολογία of Heb', O. MICHEL says, 'consequently is a firmly outlined, liturgically fixed tradition, which must be held fast by the congregation.'<sup>2</sup> MICHEL goes on to say that two suggestions have been made as to the character of this fixed confession: (1) We have to do here with a baptismal confession, to which the hearers have bound themselves once. This is supported by the fact that the formula of divine sonship (cf. Heb iv.14; vi.6; x.29) is attested often in baptismal confessions (cf., e.g., Acts ix.37). We may think in this connection also of Matthew's version of Peter's Confession (Mt xvi.16), which we hold to be authentic.<sup>3</sup> (2) The second possibility is that we have to do with a cultic-liturgical confession, which is connected with the different titles used for Christ (cf. Heb iii.1; iv.14f.) In this case, the 'place in life' of the confession would be the Eucharist (cf. Heb i.3; xiii.15). At any rate the 'confession' in Hebrews is an 'answer of the congregation to the promises of God', a confession of faith as a 'living word'. According to iii.1, its content is Jesus, the representative of God before the people ('the apostle') and the representative of the people before God ('high priest').

<sup>1</sup> See above pp.117ff., and Heb v.5-6.

<sup>2</sup> O. MICHEL, art. δμολογέω, in: TWNT V, p.216; (also the foll. cit.).

<sup>3</sup> See above pp.222ff.

The passage iii.1-6 points out the superiority of Jesus over against Moses: whereas the latter was faithful as a servant in God's 'house' (οἶκῳ, 2, 5), Jesus as 'a son' and 'as the builder of a house' (ὁ κατασκευάσας αὐτόν, 3) was faithful over God's 'house'. The last sentence of the passage makes clear that the 'house' denotes the eschatological community founded by Jesus: 'And we are his "house" if we hold fast our confidence and pride in our hope' (6b). May we regard this as a confirmation of our conjecture that 'my church' (ἐκκλησίαν) in Mt xvi.18 originally read 'my house' (οἶκόν) ?<sup>1</sup> The word αὐτοῦ (his house instead of God's house vs. 6) perhaps recalls the emphatic μου of Mt xvi.18. The following section, i.e. Heb iii.7-iv.13, contains exhortations that are based mainly on the cult psalm Ps xcv. whose 'place in life' perhaps was the renewal of the covenant.<sup>2</sup> The 'rest' (κατάπαυσιν iv.5, 10) which remains for the people of God to enter (cf. iv.6, 9) practically seems to be identical with the 'rest for your souls' (ἀναπαύσιν τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν Mt xi.29) promised by Jesus to those who take up his 'yoke' and learn from him: it is the consummation of the saving work of the Son.<sup>3</sup>

The section iv.14-v.14 resumes the main theme of the Letter, i.e. the high-priesthood of Jesus: 'Since then we have a great high priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession' (14). 'Christ (the Anointed) did not exalt himself to be made a high priest, but was appointed' (v.5a so to speak by an 'anointment oracle' (Ps ii.7).<sup>4</sup> In v.10, 11a, vi.1 the author announces his purpose to 'go on to the τελείωτα', namely λόγον, but warns his readers first from committing apostasy, thereby mentioning Abraham as an example of 'those who through faith and patience inherit the promises' (vi.12). 'We have', the author concludes, 'a hope that enters into the inner shrine behind the curtain (cf. Lev xvi.2), where Jesus has gone as a forerunner on our behalf, having become a high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek' (vi.19, 20).

With Heb vii.1 the main section of the whole Letter, which ends only with x.18, begins, namely the λόγος τελείος. 'The new and unique feature of the λόγος τελείος',

<sup>1</sup> See above p.227.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. above p.161f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. OTTO BAUERNFEIND, art. καταπαύω, κατάπαυσις in: TWNT III, p.629f., and art. ἀναπαύω, ἀναπαύσις in: TWNT I, p.352f.

<sup>4</sup> See above p.203.



J. SCHNEIDER says, 'is that the fundamental events of cross and exaltation are interpreted cultically.'<sup>1</sup> The vital point in the comparison between the priesthood of Melchizedek and the Levitical priesthood is 'perfection': '... if perfection (  $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \acute{\iota} \omega \sigma \iota \varsigma$  ) had been attainable through the Levitical priesthood ... what further need would there have been for another priest to arise after the order of Melchizedek, rather than one named after the order of Aaron?' (vii.11). We shall return to this point later.

In chapter viii the themes are the heavenly sanctuary and the new covenant. 'The chief point' in the first passage (viii.1-6) '... is this, we have ... a high priest who is also the enthroned king, ministering on our behalf in the heavenly sanctuary, of which the earthly tabernacle erected by Moses was a copy (v.5; Ex.25.40).'<sup>2</sup> Jeremiah's prophecy of the new covenant 'treats the first as obsolete' (viii.13a). The author quotes the whole passage Jer xxxi.31-34 in order to let the readers see for themselves the fault God finds with the people of the old covenant, and also in what respect the covenant Christ mediates 'is better' (  $\kappa \epsilon \iota \tau \tau \omega \nu \delta \varsigma \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu$  viii.6) namely in the universality of the knowledge of, or communion with God and the forgiveness of sins.

In the passage ix.1-10 the author admits that the worship of the first covenant intended the same but did not succeed because of the deficient quality of the sacrifices: 'According to this arrangement, gifts and sacrifices are offered which cannot perfect (  $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \acute{\iota} \omega \sigma \alpha \iota$  ) the conscience of the worshiper, but deal only with food and drink and various ablutions, regulations for the body imposed until the time of reformation' (ix.9b,10).

Over against this, 'the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish (  $\alpha \acute{\mu} \omega \mu \omega \nu$  ) to God, (shall) purify your conscience from dead works to serve the living God' (ix.14). Thus the cultic interpretation of the cross essentially means that Jesus 'has appeared once for all (  $\alpha \acute{\pi} \alpha \xi$  ) at the end of the age to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself (ix.26b; cf. 22b: 'and without shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins'). The cultic interpretation of Jesus' exaltation culminates in the following statement: 'For Christ has entered, not into a sanctuary (  $\alpha \gamma \iota \alpha$  ) made with hands, a copy of the true one, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf' (ix.24). It is quite clear that the cultic interpretation of the events of cross and exaltation of Jesus by the author of Hebrews must be understood in the first place

1 J. SCHNEIDER, art. 'Hebräerbrief', in: RGK III, col.107.

2 OAB, ad loc.

against the background of the ritual for the Day of Atonement (cf. Lev xvi.1-34).<sup>1</sup> However, it is worth noting that in Heb ix.28, 'so Christ, having been offered once to bear the sins of many' ( εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας ), part of Is liti. 12 is quoted (LXX = καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν ). Is this at the same time a reminiscence of the eucharistic words of Jesus (cf. Mt xxvi. 28 parr.)?<sup>2</sup> The efficacy of the atonement wrought by Jesus is described in the statement Heb x.14: 'For by a single offering he has perfected for all time those who are sanctified.'

The passage x.19-25 is especially interesting for a comparison between the Sermon on the Mount and the Letter to the Hebrews. The Sermon seems to imply that God and man meet so to speak 'half-way', i.e. on the holy mountain, to which man 'goes up', and where God 'appears' in the midst of his 'house'. We have suggested above that this event marks the beginning of the 'Way of the Lord' who is about to return to Mount Zion. Consequently, the 'way' of the disciples henceforth is a way of communion with the heavenly Father or the WAY OF THE SON. Over against this, the present section of the Hebrews seems to imply two different 'levels': man is on earth beneath, whilst God is in heaven above (cf. 1 Kg viii. 23f.). It is most significant that in the Letter the epithet 'Father' - which in the teaching of Jesus suggests the nearness of God to his sons and daughters - is missing, except for i.5, where it occurs in the quotation from 2 Sam vii.14, and in xii.9, where it is found in connection with the quotation Pr iii.11-12. Thus it is essentially not God who is coming, or descending to man (cf. the ἡγγικεν of Mt iv.17 parr.), but man who must 'draw near to God' ( ἐγγίζομεν τῷ θεῷ, vii.19), or 'approach' (cf. x.22, προσερχώμεθα ) God 'with a true heart' ( μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας ; cf. Is xxxviii.3: LXX = μετὰ ἀληθείας ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀληθινῇ ; MT = be'erneth ubh<sup>e</sup> lebh shalem). This approach or drawing near to God seems to be conceived of as an ascent to God Who is enthroned in heaven (cf. Heb iv.16; viii.1; xii.2). The ascent of the faithful is possible, 'since we have confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way ( ὁ δὲ ὄν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν ) which he opened for us through the curtain, that is, through his flesh, and since we have a great priest over the house of God'(x.19-21).

1 Cf. above pp. 97, 125 and 132, n.1. See also WILFRID STOTT, The Conception of 'Offering' in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in: NTS, Vol.9. No.1 (1962), pp.62ff.

2 Cf. above p.252.

The ascent to God is defined here as 'the new and living way'. Over against the 'way' taught by Jesus (i.e. the Antitheses), which presupposes God's presence and communion, this way is thought to lead to God's communion.<sup>1</sup> In this respect, then, it may be compared with the Beatitudes which - as we have noted above<sup>2</sup> - were described by AUGUSTINE as 'stages traversed towards perfection'. Thus the eschatology of the Letter to some extent resembles that of the Gospel of Matthew, in that the redactor of the latter reinterpreted the whole Sermon as 'conditions of admission' to the kingdom of heaven (cf. Mt v.20). The 'kingdom' in Matthew seems to be parallel to the 'sanctuary' in Hebrews: iii.6b shows that the 'house' (of God) denotes the eschatological community, of which - among others - the 'Hebrews' are members. Now Jesus' high-priesthood over the 'house' assures to them - in faith - the (in fact still future) entry into the heavenly 'sanctuary'. Therefore, they are exhorted to hold fast the 'confession' that guarantees their hope, the 'confession' whose essential content is Jesus, the Son and High Priest. Recalling iii.5,6a, we may assume that 'he who promised' in x.23b is Jesus rather than God (cf. 'faithful'). Furthermore, 'the Day drawing near' in x.25 points to Jesus' second coming (cf. ix.28).

The section x.26-39 warns the readers from profaning the blood of the covenant by which they were sanctified (29), and exhorts them to endure, quoting finally Heb.ii.3-4: '... my righteous shall live by faith ...'. Consequently, in xi.1-40 follows a 'Roll call of heroes and heroines of faith, designed to reinforce the exhortation in 10.35-39.'<sup>3</sup> The definition of faith (  $\pi \acute{\iota} \sigma \tau \iota \varsigma$  ), namely 'the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen', seems to point especially to the entry of the heavenly sanctuary, the goal of the 'new and living way' or - in other words - of the ascent to God (cf. x.19f). The last verse of the passage, i.e. x.40, 'that apart from us they should not be made perfect', refers back to ix.15: 'Christ's death redeemed also the Old Testament saints'.<sup>4</sup> This suggests that 'redemption' and 'perfection' are parallels; we shall return to this point.

Chapter xii again contains exhortations and warnings. Vss.1,2 depict the ascent to God as a race: '... let us also lay aside every weight, and sin which clings so closely, and let us run with

<sup>1</sup> So also W. MICHAELIS, art.  $\delta \delta \acute{o} \varsigma$  , in: TWNT V, p.79.

<sup>2</sup> See above p.272.

<sup>3</sup> OAB, ad loc.

<sup>4</sup> OAB, ad loc.



perseverance the race that is set before us, looking to Jesus the pioneer and perfecter of our faith, who for joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is seated at the right hand of the throne of God.' In the passage xii.3-11 the author interprets the suffering of the readers, referring to Pr iii.11-12, as a confirmation of their divine sonship: '...God is treating you as sons; for what son is there whom his father does not discipline?' (xii.7).

xii.12 refers to Is xxxv.3, and the following verse 13 seems to contain a rather strange allusion to the 'Way of the Lord', Is xl.3: 'and make straight paths for your feet, ...', although the expressions are not the same in the Septuagint. However, the figure of the 'Way of the Lord' perhaps also is the background against which the contrast in xii.18ff. must be understood: 'For you have not come to ... Mount S i n a i (this is implied in the description vss. 18-19) ... But you have come to Mount Z i o n and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable angels in festal gathering, and to the assembly of the first-born ( ἐκκλησιᾶς πρωτοτόκων ) who are enrolled in heaven, and to a judge who is God of all, and to the spirit of just men made perfect, and to Jesus, the mediator of a new covenant ...' (xii. 22-24). Who is meant by the 'assembly of the first-born'? The use of the term ἐκκλησιᾶς in the quotation of Ps xxii.22 in Heb ii.12 suggests that human beings and not angels are meant. It is tempting to assume that the reference is to the first circle of Jesus' disciples who 'were all together in one place' at the day of Pentecost.<sup>1</sup> This would not exclude the possibility that, at the same time, the 'heavenly Jerusalem' is meant. The designation of God as he 'who warns from heaven' seems to confirm this second possibility. In xii.28 the (religious) term 'kingdom' occurs for the first and only time: 'Therefore let us be grateful for receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken, and thus let us offer to God acceptable worship, with reverence and awe; for our God is a consuming fire.' (28,29).

From the concluding chapter xiii, the following two points are worth noting: (1) xiii.4, 'Let marriage be held in honour among all, ...' suggests that the 'new and living way' is no ascetic way (cf. Mt v.27-32). (2) Vs.14 again shows the strong eschatological emphasis of the Letter: 'For here we have no lasting city, but we seek the city which is to come.'

1 Cf. J. SCHNEIDER, art. cit. col.107: 'The new people of God is, as is evident especially from xii.18-24, a cultic community.'

The result of our brief survey of the themes of the Letter to the Hebrews is ambiguous: On the one hand the allusions to certain themes of the teaching of Jesus seem to be almost tangible, for example Jesus' divine sonship (cf. i.2,8; iii.6; iv.14; v.8; vi.6; vii.3,28; x.29), the divine sonship of his followers (cf. ii.10; xii.5,7), the eschatological community as the 'house' ('Temple') of God or Jesus (iii.1-6; x.21), Jesus the builder of a 'house' (iii.3), the reference to Ps ii.7 in connection with Jesus' 'appointment' (i.5; v.5), the cultic interpretation of events connected with Jesus (vii.1-x.18), the linking of the eschatological community with the idea of coming to Mount Zion (xii.18-24). We may even say that the outlook of the author to the Hebrews is 'hiero-centric' like that of the historical Jesus, but in the sense of being directed towards the heavenly sanctuary (ἁγία). On the other hand, it is a striking fact that the author never quotes sayings of the historical Jesus and that there is no direct or explicit reference to his teaching. Is this merely due to his method?

We now proceed to examine more closely the concept of perfection in the Letter to the Hebrews. The first question to be answered is: Where do we begin? H. P. OWEN says, 'Hebrews v.11-vi.3 is a crucial section in the Epistle's argument. Amid much that is obscure one thing is clear. The author here divides the Christian life into successive stages. Paul had already made a similar division in I Cor. ii.1-iii.3; and the author of Hebrews was doubtless aware of it. But there is a difference. For Paul the division was a temporary device necessitated by controversy with the Corinthian πνευματικοί; it does not occur elsewhere in his epistles and was in fact alien to his way of thinking. In Hebrews, on the other hand, the division is vital; it determined the author's whole outlook and approach.'<sup>1</sup> After raising the questions as to the number of the stages of Christian life and their respective character, OWEN proceeds, 'The purpose of this study is to answer these questions by analysing the text and comparing it with similar ideas that are discoverable in Philo and the Stoics.'<sup>2</sup>

As a few sentences could not do justice to OWEN's closely knit discussion, we must refer for his arguments to his study and quote here only the conclusions about the observed three stages of ascent: 'We are now able to compare and contrast Heb. v.11-vi.3 with Philo and Epictetus. In

1 H. P. OWEN, The 'Stages of Ascent' in Hebrews V.11-VI.3, in: NTS, Vol III, 1956-57, pp. 243-53, cit. p.243.

2 *ibid.*, p. 243.

positing three stages of ascent and in reserving "solid food" for the third stage the author is nearer to Philo than to Epictetus. His formulation of the third stage, however, approaches more closely to the corresponding stage in Epictetus. The abstract, catechetical quality of his propaedeutic is more akin to the Stoic "verba magistri" than to the varied curriculum of Philo. This was historically inevitable. Philo's scheme of Hellenic παιδεία was not baptized into Christianity until the next century. The author's account of the second stage has a common ground with both Philo and Epictetus in the importance which it assigns to practice as the means for ensuring stable, rational and reflective moral constitution. ... The third stage agrees with Philo in so far as it deals with a higher illumination of the spirit; but it differs profoundly from him in the kind of illumination that it offers. Philo's στερεὰ τροφή is an advanced form of intellectual vision approximating to union with the Godhead. The author of Hebrews on the other hand appears deliberately to avoid construing his στερεὰ τροφή in intellectualistic terms.<sup>1</sup>

In his book 'Hebrews - Essenes - Christians' HANS KOSMALA has contested not the interpretation of Heb. v.11-vi.3 advanced by OWEN but the authenticity of a part of this text, namely of 11b-14. 'The transmitted text', KOSMALA argues, 'contains namely in its continuation in v.11b and 12a a sharp reprimand, which is unique in the whole Letter, for nowhere the author loses his temper and sense of proportion.'<sup>2</sup> KOSMALA goes on to say later, 'a critical analysis of the language and the structure of the sentences in this section with that of Paul (e.g. in 1 Cor iii) shows that Heb v.11b-14 is only an imitation or copy of a Paulinic thought by a second hand. The whole passage besides the added "epistolary ending" probably contributed to the conjecture that the "Epistle to the Hebrews" stems from the apostle Paul. Perhaps the facts of the case are even these that these verses in chapter v together with the ending were incorporated into the Letter to the Hebrews in order to make it appear Paulinic or at least more authoratative than it should be without these additions, or that the treatise later was used as a Letter.'<sup>3</sup>

As the title of his book suggests, KOSMALA identifies the 'Hebrews' with the Essenes. 'The

---

1 H. P. OWEN, *ibid.*, p. 250.

2 H. KOSMALA, *Hebräer* (cf. above p. 179, n.5), p. 17.

3 *ibid.*, p. 20.



Letter to the Hebrews', he explains in his introduction, 'turns out to be the most clear example of the proclamation of Christ to people who were expecting the end and retribution, but obviously did not yet believe in the Christ Jesus.'<sup>1</sup> KOSMALA reconstructs the original transition from chapter v to vi as follows:<sup>2</sup> (v.8) 'Although he was a Son, he learned obedience through what he suffered. (9) And being made perfect (by God) he became the source of eternal salvation to all who obey him: (10) being designated by God a high priest after the order of Melchizedek.

(11) About this we have much to say which is hard to explain. (vi.1) Therefore, leaving the doctrines about the beginning of the Messianic life, we want to go on to (the theme of) perfection, not laying again a foundation

- on repentance from dead works
- and of faith toward God,
- (2) of instruction about ablutions,
- the laying on of hands,
- the resurrection of the dead,
- and eternal judgment.

(3) And this will we do if God permits.' The influence of KOSMALA's hypothesis is most obvious in his translation of vi.1a. In a detailed discussion he examines the sixfold 'foundation' and arrives at the conclusion that they belong to the time before the Messiah-Jesus-proclamation and in fact are identical with the elementary doctrines of the Essenes.<sup>3</sup>

KOSMALA is able to point out many striking parallels between the Letter to the Hebrews (and other parts of the New Testament) and the teaching of the Sect as evident from the Dead Sea Scrolls. However, he seems to overlook the possibility that at least some of the observed parallels might already have been part of the teaching of Jesus himself. This is evident from the section of the Letter quoted above, i.e. vi.1f: the sixfold 'foundation' suggests not necessarily that the addressees are Essenes but that 'the elementary doctrines of Christ' ( τὸν ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον ) - as KOSMALA has shown - to a great extent are identical with the elementary doctrines of the Essenes. Thus KOSMALA's original conjecture, namely 'that the

1 H. KOSMALA, *Hebräer*, p.x. On this question see also F. F. BRUCE, 'To the Hebrews', or 'To the Essenes'? in: *NTS*, Vol.9, No.3 (1963), pp. 217ff.

2 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 30/31; we follow as much as possible the RSV.

3 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 38.

addressees of the Letter to the Hebrews must have been closely connected (nahegestanden) to the Sect',<sup>1</sup> may be correct. It is also quite possible that the similarity of Essene to early Christian thought may be explained in the sense 'that many elementary doctrines of the Essenes were taken up into the early Christian theology when Essenism merged more and more with the Church.'<sup>2</sup> However, we believe that the Letter presupposes this process rather than that it originated it as a 'Missionsschreiben' addressed to the Essenes.<sup>3</sup> In this case, the essence of the proclamation of Christ contained in the Letter is not 'the Messiah = Jesus',<sup>4</sup> but 'the Son = a High Priest' ( ὁ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, cf. Heb ii.17; iii.1; iv.15; v.5,10; vi.20; vii.26; viii.1; ix.11). The latter formulation suggests that 'the Son (of God)' for the addressees already was a well-known (Messianic) designation for Jesus.

Although KOSMALA holds the word 'perfect' and the connected word-group to be 'one of the two key-terms of the Letter to the Hebrews',<sup>5</sup> he does not discuss the concept of perfection in a special section. Thus he offers no suggestions as to the proper approach to this theme. As 'the Son = a High Priest' is the main theme of the Letter, it seems expedient to begin with the perfection of the Son. Moreover, just as the perfection of the Father is the vital point of Jesus' understanding of perfection,<sup>6</sup> the perfection of the Son may be the new and decisive point of the author of Hebrews. Of course, we cannot exclude the possibility suggested by H. P. OWEN namely that the author approaches this theme from an entirely different angle.<sup>7</sup> Whether or not the passage Heb.v.11b-14 is authentic, we must reckon with various influences on the concept of perfection in Hebrews.<sup>8</sup> However, as the purpose of our present chapter merely is a comparison between Jesus' concept of perfection and that of the author to the Hebrews, the possibility of an influence from or even dependence on the teaching of Jesus is of primary interest.

1 H. KOSMALA, *Hebräer*, p. VII.

2 *ibid.*, p. X.

3 For the term quoted cf. *ibid.*, p.14.

4 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 13.

5 *ibid.*, p. 19; the other one seems to be 'holy' (cf. Heb iii.1).

6 See above p. 348.

7 B. RIGAUX, *Perfection*, pp. 257ff., seems to follow OWEN's approach.

8 Cf. also ERNST KASEMANN, *Das Wandernde Gottesvolk, Eine Untersuchung zum Hebräerbrief*, (4th ed.) Göttingen 1961.

## 2 The perfection of the Son

We quote first the texts to be considered in this section, following as closely as possible the RSV:

- (Heb ii.10) For it was fitting that He, for Whom and by Whom all things exist,<sup>1</sup> in bringing many sons to glory,<sup>2</sup> should make the pioneer of their salvation (τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν) perfect through suffering (διὰ παθμάτων τελειῶσαι)
- (11) For he who sanctifies (ὁ ... ἁγιάζων) and those who are sanctified (οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι) are all of One (ἐξ ἑνός).<sup>3</sup> That is why he (who sanctifies, i.e. the Son) is not ashamed to call them (who are sanctified, i.e. the sons) brethren, ... (17) ... he had to be made like his brethren in every respect, so that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest (ἀρχιερεὺς) in the service of God, to make expiation (εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι) for the sins of the people.
- (v.8) Although he was a Son, he learned obedience through what he suffered;
- (9) and being made perfect (τελειωθεὶς) he became the source of eternal salvation to all who obey him, being designated by God a high priest after the order of Melchizedek.
- (vi.19) We have this as a sure and steadfast anchor to the soul, a hope that enters into the inner shrine behind the curtain, (2) where Jesus has gone as a forerunner (πρόδρομος) on our behalf, having become a high priest after the order of Melchizedek.
- (vii.28) Indeed, the law appoints men in their weakness as high priests, but the word of the oath, which came later than the law, appoints a Son who has been made perfect (τετελειωμένον) for ever.

1 This formula denotes God; cf. OTTO MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, Göttingen 1949, p. 78.

2 E. KASEMANN, op. cit. p.89, and G. DELLING, art. ἀρχηγός, in: *TWNT I*, p. 486, hold that this expression refers to the 'pioneer', i.e. Jesus. See however O. MICHEL, *ibid.*, p.78.

3 So O. MICHEL, *ibid.*, p. 80: 'The "One" is a disguising description of God himself.'



(ix.24) For Christ has entered, not into a sanctuary made with hands, a copy of the true one, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence (τῷ προσώπῳ) of God on our behalf. ... (26b) he has appeared once for all (ἀπαξ) at the end of the age to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

OTTO MICHEL has made some interesting remarks about Heb ii.10 which, we believe, point the way to the right interpretation of the passages quoted above. 'The ingressive aorist ἀγαγόντα', he says, 'discloses the divine plan: the δόξα of the Son (ii.7,9) shall become the δόξα of men. πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα might in fact be an "epithet of God", and that one which stems from Palestinian-early Christian theology. From this theology stems the relationship between the Son and the "sons" (Mt v.9,45; Lk vi.20; xx.36). ... Early Christianity in Paul has side by side υἱοὶ θεοῦ and τέκνα θεοῦ (Rom viii.14,16), on the other hand, 1 Jn has only τέκνα θεοῦ (iii.1f.10; v.2). Hebrews still uses exclusively the old designation for Christians, namely υἱοὶ θεοῦ'.<sup>1</sup> Admittedly, MICHEL holds the Letter to the Hebrews as a whole to be a product of early Hellenistic Christianity.<sup>2</sup>

However, our previous interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount may throw new light on the relation not only between the teaching of Hebrews and Palestinian-early Christian theology but more concretely between the teaching of Hebrews and the teaching of the historical Jesus, especially as contained in the (authentic) Sermon. We may put it this way: it is possible that the author to the Hebrews reinterprets Jesus' concept of perfection in the light of his death and resurrection and in accordance with the theology and eschatology of his Church.

MICHEL already has suggested that the relationship between the Son and the 'sons' stems from the Sermon on the Mount; we may add: and from Mt xi.25-30. The following features point in the same direction: The verb τέλειον used nine times in the Letter - over against the verb τέλει which stresses the end (τέλος) and is not found - emphasizes the idea of completion and wholeness.<sup>3</sup> This suggests that the author has τέλειος // tamim in mind rather

1 O. MICHEL, *Hebräer*, pp. 78/79.

2 *ibid.*, p. 79.

3 O. MICHEL, *Vollkommenheit* Heb. p.335; (this was observed already by J. KÖGEL, *Der Begriff τέλειον im Hebräerbrief*, in: *Theologische Studien*, Martin Kähler dargebracht, 1905, p.40)

than τέλειος. The verb τελειοῦν in Hebrews is parallel to ἁγιάζειν (cf. ii.11; x.14; ix.13; x.10,29; xiii.12)<sup>1</sup>. 'To sanctify', J. KÜGEL says, 'means to take up into God's range of salvation (Heilsbereich), and to be sanctified means nothing else but to become God's property.'<sup>2</sup> On the one hand it has been suggested that τελειοῦν, and on the other hand that ἁγιάζειν must be translated by 'consecrate'.<sup>3</sup> These two parallel terms perhaps point to Mt v.48, where Jesus has replaced ἅγιος by τέλειος. In this case, τελειοῦν may be regarded as the stronger term which expresses the 'wholeness of consecration', over against ἁγιάζειν which originally could mean in Hebrew 'to consecrate' (cf. qidash),<sup>4</sup> and has the same meaning in Greek. Furthermore, the intimate relationship between 'perfection' and sonship also points to the Sermon on the Mount.<sup>5</sup> And finally: the concept of sonship in Mt xi.25-30, and perhaps also that in the Sermon, already implies a priestly, mediatorial function of the Son (sons).<sup>6</sup>

GOTTLOB SCHRENK describes the relationship between Jesus' sonship and his high priesthood in the Hebrews as follows, referring to v.1-10 and vii.28: 'Thus he becomes high priest by proving himself to be and standing the test as the Son. Thus he becomes at the same time the perfect (vollendet) Son. Thus he receives in turn his professional qualification as high priest. Thus the whole way is determined by the realisation of his sonship.'<sup>7</sup>

It is significant that the author of Hebrews does not say: 'The Son (who taught on the Mount, 'You... must be wholly consecrated ...') demonstrated the wholeness of his consecration when he offered up himself on the cross, in obedience to the will of God (cf. v.8). Although this from the point of view of the ministry of Jesus is correct, the author cannot put it in this way, because Jesus' suffering of death signifies his appointment as high priest. 'And one does not take the honour upon

1 So E. KASEMANN, op. cit., p.83; (the ref. is to J. KÜGEL, art.cit.).

2 J. KÜGEL, art. cit., p.58; (cit. from KASEMANN, ibid., p. 83).

3 See O. MICHEL, *Hebräer*, p. 80, n.2, with authorities quoted.

4 Cf. ibid., p. 79, n.3; MICHEL's point is that τελειοῦσθαι, ἁγιάζεσθαι, and ὁσιεύεσθαι are expressions of a priestly eschatology of early Hellenism, but that these terms have their earlier history (Vorgeschichte) in old Hebrew formulae. He mentions also τελειοῦν = tamim (kal, hitpa), and καθαρίζειν = taher.

5 See above p. 355.

6 See above pp. 366f., 369.

7 G. SCHRENK, art. ἁρχιερεὺς, in: *TWNT III*, p. 280; (our spacing).

himself,' the author argues, 'but he is called by God, just as Aaron was' (v.4). The following verses 5 and 6 make it clear that the actual appointment of Jesus as high priest is not identical with his death but with his appointment as Son, and that by linking Ps ii. 7 to Ps cx.4.

We are now able to recognise the essential meaning of the 'perfection' of the Son according to the texts quoted above: (ii.10) God thought it necessary that he, in order to bring many sons to glory, should consecrate the pioneer of their salvation wholly and conclusively through suffering ... (17b) so that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God, to make expiation for the sins of the people. (v.8) Although he was a Son, he learned obedience through what he suffered; (9) and being wholly and conclusively consecrated (by God), i.e. being manifested by God as a high priest after the order of Melchizedek, he became the source of eternal salvation to all who obey him. (vi.19) We have this as a sure and steadfast anchor to the soul, a hope that enters into the inner shrine behind the curtain, (20) where Jesus has gone as a forerunner on our behalf, having become a high priest after the order of Melchizedek. (vii.28) Indeed, the law appoints men in their weakness as high priests, but the word of the oath, which came later than the law, appoints a Son who has been wholly and conclusively consecrated for ever. (ix.24) For Christ has entered, not into a sanctuary made with hands, a copy of the true one, but into heaven itself, now (xiii.8; Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and for ever) to appear in the presence of God on our behalf. In short: The 'perfection' of the Son is his entire and conclusive consecration as High Priest by God.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 Cf. however O. CULLMANN, *Christology*, p. 92/93; CULLMANN says that the cultic interpretation of the perfection of the Son and of the sons 'alone is too narrow', and wants to include the aspect of 'moral perfection'. In our opinion this is not possible, for it would imply the 'moral perfection' of the sons 'for all time' by the single offering of Christ (x.14).



### 3 The perfection of the sons

The linguistic evidence, namely that the verb  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\upsilon\nu$  is used in a similar way both concerning the Son (cf. ii.10; v.9; vii.28) and the sons (cf. x.14), suggests that the perfection of the sons at least to some extent is the same as that of the Son. Therefore, we may paraphrase the texts relevant for the present section at once in accordance with our findings in the previous section. We quote also the texts containing the parallel terms  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$  and  $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$  :

(ii.10) For he who consecrates (  $\delta\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega\nu$  , i.e. 'takes up into God's range of salvation'<sup>1</sup>) and those who are consecrated (  $\omicron\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\alpha\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$  , i.e. 'become God's property'<sup>1</sup>) are all of One.

(ix.9) According to this arrangement, gifts and sacrifices are offered which cannot purify completely ('perfect',  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$  ) the worshipper in respect of conscience, ...

(13) For if the sprinkling of defiled persons with the blood of goats and bulls consecrates (  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota$  ) (them) as to the cleanness of the flesh, (14) how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish to God, purify (  $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\epsilon\iota$  ) your conscience from dead works to serve the living God (i.e. purify you completely, cf. ix. 9).

(x.1) For since the law has but a shadow of the good things to come instead of the true form of these realities, it can never, by the same sacrifices which are continually offered year after year, consecrate wholly and conclusively (  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$  ) those who draw near. ... (7) Then I (i.e. the Son) said, "Lo, I have come to do thy will, O God," ... (10) And by that will we have been consecrated (  $\acute{\eta}\gamma\iota\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota$  ) through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all (  $\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\zeta$  ). (11) And every priest stands daily at his service, offering repeatedly the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. (12) But when this (high priest) had offered for all time a single

---

1 J. KÖGEL, see above p. 386.

sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God, (13) then to wait until his enemies should be made a stool for his feet. (14) For by a single (μιά) offering he has wholly and conclusively consecrated (τετελείωκεν) for all time those who are God's property (τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους). (15) And the Holy Spirit also bears witness to us; for after saying, (16) "This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, says the Lord: I will put my laws on their hearts, and write them on their minds," (17) then he adds, "I will remember their sins and their misdeeds no more." (18) Where there is forgiveness of these, there is no longer any offering for sin.

The author of Hebrews explicitly states that God's property of former times, under the first covenant, is included in the wholeness of consecration wrought by Christ:

(ix.15) Therefore he is the mediator of a new covenant, so that those who are called may receive the promised eternal inheritance, since a death has occurred which redeems (εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν) them from the transgressions under the first covenant. (xi.39) And all these, though well attested by their faith, did not receive what was promised, (40) since God had foreseen something better for us, that apart from us they should not be wholly and conclusively consecrated (τελειωθῶσιν). (xii.22) But you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, ... (23) and to the assembly of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven (i.e. the earliest eschatological community)... and to the spirits of just men having been wholly and conclusively consecrated (τετελειωμένων), (i.e. the saints of the Old Covenant), (24) and to Jesus, the mediator of a new covenant, and to the sprinkled blood that speaks more graciously than the blood of Abel.

Thus the difference between the Old Covenant with its Levitical priesthood and the New Covenant with the (high) priesthood of the Son in short is this: 'perfection' (τελείωσις) is not attainable - 'perfection' is attainable (cf. vii.11,19). According to G. SCHRENK,<sup>1</sup> τελείωσις here means 'fullness of communion with God'. Through the wholeness of their

---

1 G. SCHRENK, art. ἀρχιερεὺς, in: TWNT III, P. 278.

consecration by Jesus, the sons share in a special privilege of a high priest, namely to go into 'the holy place within the veil' (Lev xvi.2), and that not only once a year but whenever they worship God: 'Therefore, brethren, since we have confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way which he opened for us through the curtain, that is, through his flesh, and since we have a great priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, with our hearts sprinkled clean from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water' (x.19-22).

Although the wholeness of consecration of the sons, the fullness of their communion with God, in short: their 'perfection' in faith and worship is a present reality (cf. τετελείωκεν, x.14), which implies their 'eternal redemption' (αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν, ix.12), the 'forgiveness' (ἄφεσις, x.18) of their sins, to some extent the character of their 'perfection' may also be described as *proleptic*. This is evident especially from vi. 19,20: at present it is in fact only 'a hope that enters into the inner shrine behind the curtain, where Jesus has gone as a forerunner on our behalf, ...'. Therefore, the author goes on to say in x.23: 'Let us hold fast "the confession of our hope" without wavering, for he who promised is faithful.' As there are two clear references to the initiation rite of baptism in the Letter, namely in the following verse x.32

( φωτισθέντες ) and earlier in vi.4 ( ἡμεῖς φωτισθέντες ),<sup>1</sup> the expression 'confession of our hope' probably refers to the baptismal confession of the readers.<sup>2</sup>

The passage xii.1-3 shows that the awareness of their dependence on Jesus on the part of the sons does not exclude their own actual engagement: '... let us run with perseverance the race that is set before us, looking to Jesus the pioneer and perfecter (τελειωτὴν) of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is seated at the right hand of the throne of God' (vss. 1b,2). 'In<sup>the</sup> connection between ἀρχηγός and τελειωτὴς τῆς πίστεως (xii.2)', O. MICHEL says, 'is revealed the unique unity of the person and work of Christ; he who is pioneer and perfecter of faith has himself reached the goal and leads others to the goal. But more is implied:

1 So E. KÄSEMANN, op. cit. p. 119.

2 For another possibility see above p. 374; cf. also our summary above p. 378.



here sonship and priesthood is included in a single expression.<sup>1</sup>

We now come to the question, Does the author divide the 'new and living way' which the Son opened for the sons into successive stages? To quote MICHEL again, 'Purification, sanctification, and perfection, καθαρίσειν, ၵγιασειν, τελειοῦν cannot be separated from each other. God purifies, sanctifies, perfects through Christ (ix.14; x.14). The uniform activity of God makes pure, holy, and perfect. Nevertheless each formula has its own worth and timbre. If the sin is taken away, man is pure; if man has become God's property, he is holy; if God demands the whole consecration (ganze Hingabe) and gives to man a goal for his life, he is perfect. Perfection is the proper fulfilment of the first commandment.'<sup>2</sup> MICHEL is right in pointing to what we have called the 'proleptic' character of perfection in Hebrews, or in other words, to its eschatological reference. However, in our opinion its 'cultic' character in the sense of 'wholeness of consecration' is more prominent, and perfection most probably is thought to begin with the rite of initiation, i.e. for early Christianity with baptism. If this is correct, it is improbable that the author divides the 'way' into successive stages.<sup>3</sup>

The ethical aspect of perfection is not central in Hebrews. According to O. PROCKSCH, the term ၵγιασμός appears in Heb xii.14 as an ethical goal: 'Strive ... for holiness (διώκετε ... τὸν ၵγιασμόν, i.e. 'Heiligung', not 'Heiligkeit') without which no one shall see the Lord.' PROCKSCH comments, 'If reconciliation is the basis of the life of the Christian, the ၵγιασμός is the ethical form of life that grows out of the basis, without which it is impossible to see Christ.'<sup>4</sup> The ethical aspect is not stressed more because the readers are in danger of 'falling away' (παραπεσόντας, vi.6), i.e. of losing the basis of their Christian life, of letting go their (baptismal) confession, and thus also their 'perfection'. In vi.10 they are even praised for their work and the love which they showed for God's sake.<sup>5</sup> 'And we desire', the author goes on to say, 'each one of you

1 O. MICHEL, Vollkommenheit Heb., p. 351.

2 *ibid.*, p. 352.

3 We shall return later to the problem of the authenticity of v.11b-14.

4 O. PROCKSCH, art. ၵγιασμός, in: TWNT I, p. 115.

5 Cf. also Heb xiii.1: 'Let brotherly love continue.'

to show the same earnestness in realizing the full assurance of hope until the end, so that you may not be sluggish, but imitators (μιμηταί) of those who through faith and patience inherit the promise' (vi.11-12).

It is worth noting that the thing to be 'imitated' is not the person itself but the 'faith' of the persons in question (cf. xiii.7 μιμεῖσθε τὴν πίστιν). 'The example is no scheme', W. MICHAELIS comments, 'but a summons to prove the faith in his own life and death.'<sup>1</sup> The idea of 'imitation' in Hebrews is connected neither with the person of Christ (or with God) nor with the concept of perfection. It is quite clear that the relationship between the Son and the sons in respect of perfection is conceived of as participation, and not as imitation. So as every high priest is chosen 'to act on behalf of (ὑπὲρ) men in relation to God.' (v.1), Jesus has entered the inner shrine 'as a forerunner on our behalf' (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, vi.20), 'to appear in the presence of God on our behalf' (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ix.24). In this connection, iii.1 is most significant: 'Therefore, holy brethren, who share (μέτοχοι) in a heavenly call, fix your eyes and minds upon Jesus (κατανοήσατε), the apostle and high priest of our confession.' What the readers have to perceive and consider is pointed out by the author of Hebrews by the characteristic word ἐφάπαξ: 'he did this once for all when he offered up himself' (vii.27; cf. ix.26; x.10). Therefore, the perfection of the Son, i.e. his entire and conclusive consecration as High Priest, cannot and must not be imitated.

Nevertheless, the entire consecration of the sons to some extent also implies a priestly function: 'Through him then let us continually offer up a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips that acknowledge his name. Do not neglect to do good and to share what you have, for such sacrifices are pleasing to God' (xiii.15,16). In these verses the cultic term θυσία is spiritualised, and the whole idea seems to be mentioned in passing only. However, ix.14 suggests that in fact we have to do here with a central idea: the whole purpose of the purification, and consequently also of the sanctification and entire consecration of the sons by the blood of Christ is εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι. λατρεύειν is a cultic term and denotes always the service of God, in the first place in the sense of 'to offer' (cf. Heb viii.5; ix.9; xiii.10).

---

1 W. MICHAELIS, art. μιμέομαι, in: TWNT IV, p. 668.

Thus ix.14 - taken together with xiii.15,16 - implies that the purpose of the consecrated life of the sons is the true service of the living God.<sup>1</sup> This idea has been put in this way: 'The Christians are priests under the head of the ἀρχιερεύς Christ.'<sup>2</sup> We may recall here also 1 Peter ii.9: 'But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood ( βασιλικὸν ἱεράτευμα ), a holy nation, God's own people, that you may declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.' The terminology of Hebrews - perhaps together with 1 Pet ii.9 - has had a lasting influence in the Christian Church - however, the fact that the priesthood of all believers is implied has often been forgotten. We are now able to recognize the possibility that this idea may stem from the historical Jesus, who taught on the Mount: 'You, therefore, must be wholly consecrated ... (Mt v.48).

Admittedly, our approach to the concept of perfection in the Letter to the Hebrews is very one-sided, and our brief discussion has left aside many relevant questions. Especially the problems posed by the passage v.11b-14 are still unsolved. When we recall the interpretation of this passage by H. P. OWEN, and compare it with our own attempt at an interpretation of perfection in Hebrews, the respective findings seem to be almost incompatible. Only a comprehensive approach, which takes into account all possible influences on the concept of perfection and discusses all relevant literature,<sup>3</sup> can represent this concept adequately. Of course, this cannot be the purpose of the present study.

In support of the possibility that perfection in Hebrews depends to some extent on Jesus' concept of perfection (Mt v.48), two further points may be mentioned: (1) In xiii.8, 9a we read, 'Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and for ever. Do not be led away by diverse and strange teachings;...' Although the particular question of 'food' is mentioned in 9b, 9a may also imply that the author regards his own teaching in the Letter as being in line with earlier tradition. (2) The same is suggested by the passage ii.-1-4: 'Therefore we must pay the closer attention to what we have heard, lest we drift away from it. ... (3) how shall we escape if we neglect such a great salvation? It was declared at first by the Lord, and it was attested to us by those who heard him, ...' It is quite clear from this

1 Cf. H. STRATHMANN, art. λατρεύω, in: TWNT IV, p. 64; as another possible explanation STRATHMANN points to the privilege of the priest to enter into the holy place.

2 Cf. G. SCHRENK, art. ἀρχιερεύς in: TWNT III, p. 284; the ref. is to ORIGEN; SCHRENK points out here the influence of Heb on the Old Church.

3 See e.g., the lit. mentioned by R. RIGAUX, Perfection, p. 257, n.3.



last sentence that the message (teaching) of Jesus was 'attested' to the readers - and to the author himself by Jesus' own disciples. This may help to explain also the observed fact that no sayings of Jesus are quoted in Hebrews: they are already known by the readers, and thus on the one hand repetition is unnecessary, and on the other hand allusions to the teaching of Jesus are recognised without direct reference.<sup>1</sup>

We may venture, then, to sum up our brief investigation of the present section: The 'perfection' of the sons is their entire and conclusive consecration to a priestly service (ix.14) by the single offering of Christ (x.14), which gives to them the privilege to draw near to God (x.19f.) and to offer to him spiritual sacrifices of praise and good works (xiii.15,16). Perfection (τελειώσις, vii.11) as a noun denotes fullness of communion with God, which implies forgiveness of sins (x.18), eternal redemption (ix.12) and salvation (σωτηρία, cf. 11.10, ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας; v.9, αἵτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου; vi.9; ix.28).

We may finally compare these findings of our tentative interpretation of the concept of perfection in the Letter to the Hebrews with P. J. DU PLESSIS' summary of his more thorough investigation of the same concept: 'Casting a rapid glance over the material provided by the Epistle to the Hebrews two very clear dimensions meet our gaze. One is the notion of a consummate attainment by Christ, the other is pendent of participation by the individual believer. Within the confines of the former, the verb worded the distinct characteristics of Christ's supreme achievement. These have been signalized as of cultic-sacral, official and personal-existential nature. From this pinnacle of attainment a track leads to the abode of the community, whose indwellers become joint-heirs to the fruit of His work. What the relationship between the Son and the sons proved to be was no less than the impregnable basis of Christology for soteriology. By unflagging perseverance under circumstances entirely equivalent to all the exigencies of human nature He crowned redemptive history. With analogies fetched from the cultic tradition of the O. T. these motifs of atonement and expiation were forged into an imposing figure portraying the state and status of those participating in His all-sufficient sacrificial self-surrender. Thus each individual is incorporated into the new

---

<sup>1</sup> See however H. KOSMALA, *Hebräer*, pp. 14ff.

reality and community of the sons. Thus also they derive their perfection from the supreme act of Christ, its nature being the plenitude of salvation or the full properties of redemption. ... In these vestments the Epistle to the Hebrews protrudes the idea of perfection by medium of the terms under discussion. What it radiates is the supreme principle of a High Priest accomplishing to perfection what cultic practice sought: the atonement of man with God. By this accomplishment the suppliant is perfected and called to the maturity coinciding with his redemption.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 P. J. DU PLESSIS, Teleios, p. 232/33.

## CONCLUSIONS

We have pointed out in the introduction,<sup>1</sup> that the main purpose of the present study of 'Christian Perfection' is to examine the question whether the New Testament teaching concerning this subject originated with Jesus himself, and, if the answer is in the affirmative, to expound, as far as possible, Jesus' own understanding of perfection. Our point of departure has been the Sermon on the Mount, for we expected Mt v-vii - where the term 'perfect' is found - to contain a group of authentic sayings. The emphasis of our investigation has been on the exegesis of the relevant texts which, however, we tried to understand also against their historical background. It was hoped, furthermore, that a contribution to the new quest of the historical Jesus would result from this study.

Looking back on the preceding discussion, we wholeheartedly agree with HEINZ ZÄHRNT, who - from the point of view of the new quest - says about the 'elements of tradition': 'Here the burden of proof has become greater: we no longer have to prove their unauthenticity, but (and this is far harder) their authenticity.'<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, we disapproved from the beginning of the basic methodological principle of ZÄHRNT and others, namely, 'On the whole we can feel ourselves to be on safe ground where a tradition can be derived neither from a Jewish environment nor from the thought-world of primitive Christianity.'<sup>3</sup> Over against this we have suggested that the new quest needs a change of emphasis: the problems of continuity between the Old Testament scheme of salvation and the teaching of the historical Jesus ought to be our primary concern. In this connection, an observation made by OTTO MICHEL is worth quoting. He says at the end of his commentary on Hebrews about the 'Hellenization of Christianity', or, in other words, about the continuity between the old traditions and the thought-forms of the Hellenistic-gnostic environment: 'Yet this "Hellenization" takes place not by stripping off the old traditions and forms of tradition but under their

---

1 See above p. 19.

2 H. ZÄHRNT, *op. cit.*, p.107; (cf. above p.15).

3 *ibid.*, p. 107.



protection and as their consequences. The new concepts and thoughtforms want to interpret the tradition, not to replace it.<sup>1</sup>

MICHEL's observation is valid not only in connection with the attitude of the authors of the New Testament writings with regard to the old traditions, but to a great extent also in connection with the attitude of the historical Jesus with regard to the Old Testament traditions: the new concepts and thought-forms of Jesus want to interpret the Old Testament traditions. Or, in A. RICHARDSON's words, '... Jesus himself is the author of the brilliant reinterpretation of the Old Testament scheme of salvation ("Old Testament Theology") which is found in the New Testament ...'.<sup>2</sup>

#### A The historical Jesus

(1) Our main contribution to the new quest is the hypothesis that the outlook of the historical Jesus to a great extent is hiero-centric.<sup>3</sup> This implies that the Old Testament scheme of salvation that is re-interpreted by Jesus is derived mainly from the temple cult and worked out following the lines already indicated by the prophetic re-interpretation of the same. We think here in the first place of the figure of the 'Way of the Lord', in Deutero-Isaiah, which depicts Yahweh's eschatological return to Mount Zion together with his people against the background of the festal processions in ancient Israel, especially at the Enthronement festival.<sup>4</sup> We have tested that hypothesis provisionally in chapter V, 'Jesus and the Temple',<sup>5</sup> and arrived at the conclusion that it is probable that the outlook of the historical Jesus to a great extent is hiero-centric.<sup>6</sup> This implies that if not the detailed chronological order of the story of Jesus, the basic pattern of his ministry, i.e. the 'Way of the Lord', is authentic after all. Jesus seems to have enacted this 'Way' in his final journey from Galilee to Jerusalem.<sup>7</sup> Of course, further examination is needed on this point.

1 O. MICHEL, *Hebräer*, p. 370; (our spacing).

2 See above p. 18.

3 See above pp. 67, 198.

4 See above pp. 56, 78/79.

5 See above pp. 198ff.

6 See above p. 256.

7 See above pp. 21 (cit. K. L. SCHMIDT), and 256.

(2) A second point that has become probable is this: the title 'Son of God' goes back to Jesus himself,<sup>1</sup> and actually may be the primary designation of Jesus for himself.<sup>2</sup> This implies that Jesus interpreted his Messiahship<sup>3</sup> in terms of sonship. As 'no known ancient text definitely calls the Messiah "Son of God",' this interpretation most probably is Jesus' own idea, which may have been based on Ps ii.<sup>4</sup> 'Son of God' in the context of Ps ii is a cultic concept and a royal designation, which essentially describes the earthly king as the mediator through whom Yahweh blesses and rules his people.<sup>5</sup> Thus we may assume that Jesus understood himself to be the royal Son of God, the eschatological representative of the heavenly King and Father. Our contention that 'Son of God' may be Jesus' primary designation for himself is supported by the account of Jesus' baptism,<sup>6</sup> of his transfiguration,<sup>7</sup> by Mt xi.27 par., which perhaps recalls Peter's Confession,<sup>8</sup> and by the fact that the Letter to the Hebrews presupposes the centrality of this designation.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount applies the concept of sonship to his followers, which - taken together with Mt xi.27 - implies that he himself is the Son, and that his followers participate in his sonship.<sup>10</sup> The same idea, namely 'through the Son one becomes

---

1. On this possibility see O. CULLMANN, *Christology*, p. 279.

2. See however O. CULLMANN, *ibid.*, p. 290: 'Jesus' primary designation for himself is not "Son of God" but "Son of Man".' On the latter designation see above pp. 228ff.

3. Cf. J. KLAUSNER, *Jesus*, p. 255/56: 'A theory has been put forward that Jesus never regarded himself as the Messiah and only after his death was he acclaimed as Messiah by his disciples. But had this been true it would never have occurred to his disciples (simple-minded Jews) that one who had suffered crucifixion ("a curse of God is he that is hanged") could be the Messiah; and the messianic idea meant nothing whatever to the Gentile converts. "Ex nihilo nihil fit": when we see that Jesus' messianic claims became a fundamental principle of Christianity soon after his crucifixion, this is a standing proof that even in his lifetime Jesus regarded himself as the Messiah.'

4. See however O. CULLMANN, *ibid.*, p. 274; (cit. here too).

5. See above p. 123, and the whole section 3, The Sonship of the king, pp. 102ff.

6. See above p. 203.

7. See above p. 235.

8. See above pp. 224/25, and 364f.

9. See above pp. 373, and 382; Hebrews' contribution, then, is not the ref. to Ps ii.7 (cf. i.5), but the joining of this oracle to Ps cx.4 (v. 5,6).

a son', is contained in Heb ii.10. Finally, the centrality of the designation 'Son of God' is strongly supported by the way Jesus used the divine epithet 'Father'.<sup>1</sup>

We cannot concern ourselves here with the dogmatic consequences of the observations about the sonship of Jesus mentioned here. On all points further investigation is needed. If Jesus actually derived his concept of sonship mainly from Ps ii.7 - of course we cannot be certain about this - , this suggests that he understood it in a cult-functional rather than in an ontological sense.<sup>2</sup> On the whole, two mistakes must be avoided, namely (a) ascribing to Jesus himself 'the intention of using the Son of God designation to say something about the Son's identity of substance with the Father';<sup>3</sup> and (b) ascribing to Jesus the general idea of 'universal sonship' in accordance with the 'universal Fatherhood' of God.<sup>4</sup> We believe that the reference of Jesus' concept of sonship to Ps ii.7 points to a deeper understanding in accordance with Hebrew thought, which we tried to define in our spaced statement above. Does the reference to Ps ii.7 imply that Jesus participated in the 'renaissance of mythology' observed by A. BENTZEN in the early Church?<sup>5</sup> In that the concept of sonship in Ps ii.7 in turn was taken over by ancient Israel from a mythological context,<sup>6</sup> Jesus has pointed the early Church in that direction. However, it is not likely that Jesus himself used mythological conceptions that were current in the ancient Near East in connection with his concept of divine sonship. As far as this could be done, Jesus taught his concept of divine sonship to his disciples in the Sermon on the Mount. As to his own filial consciousness, we only can repeat A. M. HUNTER's words, 'Here of course we are in the realm of ultimate mystery. The secret of the Father remains with the Son alone. No man knew, or knows, why the Father chose Jesus of Nazareth.'<sup>7</sup>

---

1 See above p. 369; (cit. RICHARDSON), and O. CULLMANN, Christology, p. 289.

2 See above p. 105.

3 O. CULLMANN, *ibid.*, p. 270.

4 If we understand him correctly, this is what H. ZAHNNT is doing, cf. *op. cit.*, p.144: 'In his Sonship, Jesus restores our lost sonship. ... Thus the Sonship of Jesus reveals the Fatherhood of God: the Father knows the Son and the Son knows the Father.'

5 See above p. 74.

6 See above pp. 111ff.

7 See above p. 365.



Another point must be added here: it is probable that Jesus knew himself to be not only the Son but also the 'Servant of God'.<sup>1</sup> Both originally are royal titles; they are connected by the idea of 'representation'.<sup>2</sup> In the texts discussed in the present study, i.e. in the early teaching of Jesus, the title 'Son' is more prominent, whilst from the Transfiguration onwards the 'Servant' motif comes more and more to the fore. Both titles are contained in the expression 'King-Messiah' - and there is evidence that Jesus actually was crucified as 'King-Messiah'.<sup>3</sup>

#### B The Sermon on the Mount

Towards the end of chapter II we have advanced the following hypothesis: In the view of Jesus himself the Mount of the Sermon was meant to recall Mount Zion, and his 'going up' together with his disciples marked the beginning of the 'Way of the Lord', i.e. of God's eschatological return to Zion and His subsequent Enthronement as King of all nations.<sup>4</sup> After considering the 'presupposition' of the Sermon,<sup>5</sup> the attempt was made at a cultic interpretation of the same, in accordance with its observed cultic character.<sup>6</sup> Thus testing our hypothesis, we arrived at the following conclusions:

(3) The function of the Beatitudes is the initiation of the disciples into the kingdom of heaven, which herewith to a certain extent already becomes a present reality, or, in other words, the adoption of the disciples as 'sons of God'.<sup>7</sup>

(4) This seems to imply that for his disciples Jesus re-interpreted the concept of the kingship of Yahweh in terms of divine Fatherhood.<sup>8</sup> We note that this is parallel to his interpretation of Messiahship mentioned above.

---

1 See above p. 203; (cf. n.4).

2 See above p. 202.

3 See above p. 252; cf. however, T. W. MANSON, The Servant Messiah; the title seems to imply what MANSON explicitly says on p. 57: the Messiah 'must be pre-eminently God's servant'.

4 See above p. 63.

5 See above pp. 68ff.

6 See above p. 67.

7 See above p. 266.

8 See above pp. 267ff.

(5) The passage Mt v.13-16 contains two divine decrees, which define the titles and the mission of the eschatological community: (a) the disciples are 'the salt of the earth', i.e. theirs is an everlasting 'covenant of salt' which is of universal significance;<sup>1</sup> (b) they are 'the light of the world', i.e. their mission consists in reflecting the glory of God, and in playing the part of intermediary for the nations. It is worth noting that the mission of the eschatological community is parallel to that of the 'Servant' according to Is xlii.6 and xlix.6. This confirms our earlier conclusions that in the mind of Jesus 'Son' and 'Servant' belong together, and that the disciples are meant to participate in Jesus' sonship and in his mission as Servant.<sup>2</sup>

(6) The Antitheses are the directions of the heavenly Father to guide the eschatological community in His way;<sup>3</sup> the antithetical formulae, 'You have heard that it was said to the men of old ... But "I" say to you ...', imply that God now is speaking in a new way: not through a prophet or priest but through the Son (cf. Heb i.1,2).<sup>4</sup> Understood against their cultic background, the Antitheses imply the eschatological renewal of the covenant.<sup>5</sup>

(7) The authentic Sermon on the Mount, i.e. roughly Mt v.3-10, 13-16, 21-24, 27-48; vii.24-27, may be described as the festal liturgy for the inauguration of the kingdom of heaven.<sup>6</sup>

We believe that the test of our hypothesis has been successful, and that the cultic interpretation of the Sermon has demonstrated its validity: it has revealed the structure of the authentic Sermon and the identity and mission of its author, namely, Jesus is the Son of God, the builder of the spiritual 'House', i.e. the eschatological community, where God exercises His fatherly rule.<sup>7</sup>

---

1 See above p. 300/01.

2 See above pp. 302-04.

3 See above p. 313.

4 See above p. 315/16.

5 See above p. 316; (cf. Jer xxxi.31-34).

6 See above p. 371.

7 See above pp. 75, and 370; we may add here that the community is meant to participate in Jesus' sonship and mission.

# C Jesus' concept of perfection in the context of the Sermon on the Mount

From our cultic interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount, two points emerge clearly, namely (a) the centrality of the conception of God's coming (theophany) and presence, and (b) the fundamental importance of the notion that 'life' (salvation) depends on man's relation to Him Who is Coming.<sup>1</sup> In Mt v. 48 the concept of 'perfection' is used in order to express these two points.<sup>2</sup> As in the early Church the emphasis was on the coming of Christ,<sup>3</sup> and on the gift of the Holy Spirit,<sup>4</sup> we have to do here most probably with an authentic saying of the historical Jesus.

(8) Origin: W. EICHRODT and R. BULTMANN already have pointed out that the religious term 'perfect' (tamim) in the Old Testament stems from sacrificial terminology, where it denotes the 'wholeness' or 'integrity' of the sacrificial animal, and is reapplied to the worshipper himself.<sup>5</sup> As long as the Temple stood on holy Mount Zion, where 'almost constantly the smoke of sacrifices curled towards the skies',<sup>6</sup> the cultic origin of the concept of perfection - at least when used in a 'cultic' context - most probably was known in Israel. This is the impression we got from our examination of the 'place in life' of tamim in the Old Testament,<sup>7</sup> in the Dead Sea Scrolls,<sup>8</sup> and to some extent also from our investigation into the concept of 'perfection' in Hebrews.<sup>9</sup> Hence it is reasonable to think that Jesus himself was aware of the cultic origin of the term perfect used by him in the Sermon.

(9) Character: Jesus' concept of 'perfection' is of a cultic and

---

1 See above pp. 57f. on the theme of Jesus' message (Mt iv. 17 par.) which contains the same two points.

2 See above pp. 347, 350.

3 See e.g. the Christological re-interpretation of the 'Way' in Mt iii. 3 par., above p. 55.

4 Cf. e.g. Acts ii; see above p. 253/54.

5 See above pp. 130f.

6 See above p. 206; (cit. LOHMEYER).

7 See above pp. 137ff., 161ff.,

8 See above pp. 183ff., 194ff.

9 See above pp. 384ff., 388ff.



relational character,<sup>1</sup> like that of the Old Testament,<sup>2</sup> and perhaps also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>3</sup> The character of 'perfection' in Hebrews is essentially still the same.<sup>4</sup>

(10) *Meaning*: The meaning of Jesus' concept of perfection may be described as 'wholeness of consecration', and accordingly the best translation of Mt v.48 is this:

You, therefore, must be wholly consecrated,  
as your heavenly Father is wholly consecrated.<sup>5</sup>

The fact that this saying is modelled after Lev xix.2 suggests that 'perfection' is the main characteristic of the eschatological community.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, the relation between this saying and the Beatitudes implies that we have to do here with the 'conditio sine qua non' for its membership.<sup>7</sup>

The unique feature of Jesus' concept of perfection is that he ascribes 'perfection' to God. This links 'perfection' to Jesus' central conception of theophany. For it implies that the realisation of perfection, i.e. the wholeness of the disciple's consecration, can only be attained through God's initiative, i.e. through His 'coming' to dwell in the midst of His eschatological community, or, in other words, through the wholeness of His consecration.<sup>8</sup>

(11) *Subject*: in Hebrews it is quite clear that God is the ultimate subject of perfection: He 'perfects' the Son through suffering (Heb ii.10),<sup>9</sup> and the Son in turn 'perfects' the sons by his single offering of himself (Heb x.14).<sup>10</sup> Looking back from here to Mt v.48 it is probable that Jesus is the subject of the perfection of the sons in Mt v.48a too (cf. Mt v.45). In this case, the relation to the Beatitudes is confirmed: they imply not only that

---

1 See above p. 347.

2 See above p. 159; cf. also p. 172.

3 See above p. 197.

4 See above p. 385.

5 See above p. 347, and 350.

6 See above p. 343.

7 See above p. 345.

8 See above p. 351.

9 See above p. 387.

10 See above p. 394.

Jesus initiates the disciples into the kingdom, but also that he consecrates them entirely to God, or, to their service as God's sons. If 'perfection' denotes also for Jesus the fulness of communion with God,<sup>1</sup> this links up with our interpretation of Mt xi.25-30; the disciples participate in Jesus' communion with the Father.<sup>2</sup>

If God, or Jesus, is the subject of perfection, the following two interpretations of perfection are not in accordance with the teaching of Jesus: (a) the legalistic interpretation of perfection by the final redaction of Matthew, which makes man the subject of his perfection ('... unless your righteousness exceeds ...', Mt v.20; 'keep the commandments...', xix.17);<sup>3</sup> and (b) the interpretation of perfection in terms of 'imitation'.<sup>4</sup> HELMUT THIELICKE is right in saying that the 'imitatio-piety' has a legalistic tendency: 'Christ hereby becomes a law'.<sup>5</sup> In this case too man is thought of as the subject of perfection.

(12) *Way*: The re-interpretation of the 'Way of perfection' taught by Jesus in terms of a 'Way to perfection' by Luke and the author to the Hebrews is evident from the following comparison:

Enter by the narrow gate; ...

For the gate is narrow and the way is hard,

that leads to life,

and those who find it are few. (Mt vii.13-14)

Strive to enter by the narrow door;

for many, I tell you,

will seek to enter and will not be able. (Lk xiii.24)<sup>6</sup>

'We have ... a hope that enters into the inner shrine behind the curtain, where Jesus has gone as a forerunner on our behalf ...' (Heb vi.19,20). 'Therefore, brethren, since we have confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way which he opened for us through

---

1 See above p. 389/90; (Heb vii.11).

2 See above p. 367.

3 See above p. 341.

4 See above pp. 337 (TRILLING); 340 (DAVIES); and 356 (DE BOER). Cf. also P. J. DUPLESSIS, *Teleios*, p. 171, and E. J. TINSLEY, *Imitation*, p. 114; and finally p. 343.

5 H. THIELICKE, *Theologische Ethik*, Vol. I, (2nd ed.) Tübingen 1958, pp. 309,313.

6 See above p. 212.

the curtain, that is, through his flesh, ...' (Heb x.19,20).<sup>1</sup> It has become clear from our investigation that the 'Way' taught by Jesus presupposes the 'entry through the narrow gate', i.e. initiation, consecration, and adoption, and thus is the 'Way of perfection' in the sense of the 'Way of communion with God' or THE WAY OF THE SON.<sup>2</sup> This Way leads to (eternal) 'life'.

Over against this, Luke's re-interpretation of the saying Mt vii.13-14 transfers the 'door' to the future. Although 'perfection' in the view of Hebrews is a present reality, its character to some extent merely is proleptic:<sup>3</sup> the 'new and living way' of the Christians leads to the presence of God who is thought to be enthroned in heaven.<sup>4</sup> The reason for this re-interpretation is that the Way of the Christians to some extent is conceived of as analogous to the Way of the exalted Christ, who now 'is seated at the right hand of the throne of God' (Heb xii.2). It is worth noting that as to the final stage of Christ's Way, i.e. to the Cross, there is no question of analogy in the life of the Christians: 'he did this once for all when he offered up himself' (vii.27).<sup>5</sup>

In this connection we may recall H. P. OWEN's interpretation of Heb v.11-vi.3 in the sense of an 'ascent' in three stages, which follows Christ's way to the eternal, or to 'heavenly perfection'.<sup>6</sup> Even if Heb v.11b-14 is an interpolation and not in accordance with the view of the author of Hebrews, OWEN's interpretation is important for the following reason: Although the third stage does not completely agree with Philo's third stage (intellectual vision approximating to union with the Godhead)<sup>7</sup>, it is probable that we have to do here with the intermediate stage between Jesus' Way of perfection and the 'new and living way' of the author of Hebrews on the one hand, and the 'Mystic Way' with its three stages, purgative, illuminative, and unitive, on the other hand.<sup>8</sup>

1 See above p. 377/78.

2 See above p. 359.

3 See above p. 390.

4 See above p. 377/78.

5 See above p. 392.

6 Cf. art. cit., p. 252.

7 See above p. 381.

8 According to ALBAN GOODIER, S. J., An Introduction to the Study of Ascetical and Mystical Theology, London 1938, p. 141, 'The division goes back to Pseudo-Dionysius, about the time of St. Augustine, ...'. On the 'Mystic Way' see also EVELYN UNDERHILL, Mysticism, (University Paperbacks) London 1960, pp. 167ff.



Finally, it is interesting to compare the 'Way' described in the Javanese mystic document 'Suluk Gatolotjo' with the 'Way' of Jesus and the 'new and living way' of Hebrews: 'On the basis of the mystic "travelling"-scheme', PHILIPPUS VAN AKKEREN says, 'in which the descent and the ascent of the divine being are described (in Javanese sangkan-paran; in Arabic tanazzul and tarakki) we examined the suluk Gatolotjo. Both the descent and the ascent we pointed out. In our document just like in Sungsang Bawan Balik the greatest stress lies on the doctrines about the return and the ascent toward God. Is not in general for mysticism this way the most important? - Gatolotjo often speaks about mortifying his passions and of returning his ego to its origin in the godhead. He also testifies to his advance on this road, even to his already having become the Perfect Man. That means to him having reduced his personality so far already that only the most spiritual elements are still left, in expectation of his ultimately being unified with God. Now he is the ideal male or the Perfect Man. Here a part of the thought-world about Insān kāmīl of Islamic mysticism lives on, by the side of Hindoo-Javanese tendencies. ... A man who turns away from everything else and who completely concentrates on this life-principle is called the Perfect Man (insān kāmīl).'<sup>1</sup>

According to Jesus, a man who renounces all attachments and who is wholly consecrated to God in the sense of the Beatitudes is called the perfect man, or a 'son of God'. Over against mysticism, Jesus strongly emphasizes the ethical obligation of perfection: the 'perfect man' is to walk in the Way of perfection, or the son must walk in THE WAY OF THE SON (cf. Antitheses).

#### D Practical conclusions

We do not want to close the present study of 'Christian Perfection' without saying a few words about practical conclusions which may be derived from it. In his summary, T. OSNES has repeatedly called attention to the relation between perfection and Baptism (initiation).<sup>2</sup> It may be said that the same relation is implied in the Missionary Charge Mt xxviii.16-20, in that the making of disciples, or the initiation into the eschatological community, here has two aspects, namely 'baptizing' and

1 PH. VAN AKKEREN, A Monster, Yet the Perfect Man, The Javanese Suluk Gatolotjo, published, translated and explained, (in Dutch, with an English Summary), 'S-Gravenhage 1951, pp. 159-161.

2 See for example above p. 353.

'teaching', and that the latter obviously refers to the Sermon on the Mount.<sup>1</sup> The outlook of the Missionary Charge is different from that of the historical Jesus: whereas Jesus envisages the coming of the Gentiles to Mount Zion as a result of the final epiphany of God and his enthronement as King of all nations,<sup>2</sup> the Missionary Charge commissions the eschatological community to go out in order to gather the nations unto the risen Lord.<sup>3</sup> However, the sending out to the nations to some extent already was prefigured by the Sending Out of the Twelve to Israel (Mt x par.). Furthermore, the difference mentioned above is only relative. J. J. VON ALLMEN says, 'If, at first sight, the mission of the New Testament seems to be centrifugal, it is so in order to become centripetal. Men go into the world to gather it in; men cast their net in order to draw it in; they sow that they may garner.'<sup>4</sup>

We have noted above already that the purpose of the Sermon on the Mount in the view of Jesus is perhaps twofold, namely: (a) the initiation of the disciples into the communion with the Father, or their consecration, and (b) the preparation of the eschatological community for their mediatorial function at the time of God's final manifestation, through which he will bring the nations into communion with Himself.<sup>5</sup> The appropriate 'place in life' of the Sermon on the Mount in the present Church is catechetical instruction.<sup>6</sup> Strictly speaking the Beatitudes belong to prebaptismal instruction. Here the question is, 'What is to prevent my being baptized?' (Acts viii.36b), and the 'conditions of admission' proclaimed by Jesus on the Mount ought to be of primary concern. If our contention that Mt v.48a refers to the Beatitudes is correct, the goal of the prebaptismal instruction is the 'perfection' of the catechumens, i.e. their entire consecration to God, which is signified by their baptism. We have to remember, of course, that God is the ultimate subject of perfection.

---

1 See above pp. 27, and 254.

2 See above p. 251f.

3 This difference is not recognized by W. D. DAVIES, *Setting*, p. 223, when he says, '... Matthew's understanding of the Church as under commission to go to the Gentiles, as revealed, for example, in viii.11; xxviii.16ff., points to a concern for the latter which was absent or, at best, secondary in the days of Jesus' flesh, as in x.5.'

4 Cit. from R. MARTIN-ACHARD, *op. cit.* p.78, n.8.

5 See above p. 369.

6 J. JEREMIAS, *Sermon*, p. 23/24, says that this is the original function of the Sermon.

The divine decrees Mt v.13-16 may be used in baptismal services as liturgical formulations which confirm the initiation of the catechumens and express the obligation to participate in the mission of the Church. The 'place in life' of the Antitheses is postbaptismal teaching. The purpose of postbaptismal teaching is to guide the initiates in the Way of the Son (sons), or in the Way of perfection. As soon as one loses sight of the initiation into the presence of God, or if perfection never actually is realised, the teaching (or preaching) of the Church inevitably is understood as 'Law' in the sense of an external, unchangeable authority which demands blind submission. The initiated, however, understand the divine directions as the guidance of the heavenly Father whose intention is to show his sons and daughters the best possible way.

Another danger is evident from the following passage by A. G. HÖNIG: 'I remember many a conversation in Java with men coming from this (mystical) way of understanding the relation between God and man, and of mystic-philosophic thinking. We could speak for hours about what we need to get, inner peace and happiness. But in that connection the Bible, as God's message to us about these subjects, was always called completely unsatisfying. The Bible was said not to give "a way". The Bible was said to ask "only" for belief in God. That could be nothing more than the first phase. Man needs to go beyond this "crude" way of thinking about the relation between God and man. A message about "the wonderful works of God" coming to us in His revelation?' "No sir, that could not be the last and definite thing to lead me to the real goal." The end of every conversation was a smile meaning to indicate this in a courteous way.<sup>1</sup> If the Javanese get the impression that the Bible does not give a 'way', the fault is entirely on the side of the Christian missionaries. Just as 'the first century mission Churches in Asia and Europe made headway precisely because they confronted the world with a way of life, and not with a speculative system,'<sup>2</sup> the contemporary mission Churches will make headway if they confront the world anew with the WAY OF THE SON.

That the WAY OF THE SON is a 'more excellent way' (1 Cor xii.31)<sup>3</sup> than the 'ways'

---

1 A. G. HÖNIG, "Javanism" and its Scriptures, in: The South East Asia Journal of Theology, Vol. No. 1, July 1959, p. 61.

2 J. S. STEWART, cf. above p. 65.

3 As is well known, Paul describes this way in 1 Cor xiii as the way of love.



of the world-religions and any other 'way' can be shown convincingly not merely by preaching and teaching but above all by the way of life of the eschatological community, the Church. Therefore, Jesus' introduction to the WAY OF THE SON which shows that the purpose of the wholly consecrated life of the sons is the glorification of the Father, is a fitting close of the present study of Christian perfection:

Let your light s o shine before men,

that they may see your good works,

and give glory to your Father who is in heaven. (Mt v. 16).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books, essays and articles referred to in the present study; the articles in the TWNT are not reported here. See also the list of Abbreviations.

- AALLEN, S., "'Reign" and "House" in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels', in: NTS, Vol. VIII, 1961-62, pp. 215-240.
- AKKEREN, PH. VAN, A Monster, Yet the Perfect Man, The Javanese Suluk Gatolotjo, published, translated and explained, 'S. Gravenhage 1951.
- ALLEGRO, J. M., The Dead Sea Scrolls, (Pelikan Books) Harmondsworth 1961.
- ARVEDSON, T., Das Mysterium Christi, Eine Studie zu Mt 11.25-30, Leipzig-Uppsala 1937.
- BALTENWEILER, H., Die Verklärung Jesu, Zürich 1959.
- BARTH, G., 'Matthew's Understanding of the Law', in: G. BORNKAMM - G. BARTH - H. J. HELD, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew (ET), London 1963.
- BARRETT, C. K., The Gospel according to St. John, An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text (reprinted) London 1956.
- BAUER, J. B., 'Das milde Joch und die Ruhe', Matth. 11.28-30, in: TZ, Jahrg. 17, Heft 2, März-April 1961.
- BENTZEN, A., King and Messiah (ET), London 1955.
- BETZ, O., 'Felsenmann und Felsengemeinde', Eine Parallele zu Mt 16.17-19 in den Qumran-psalmen, in: ZNW 48, 1957.
- BIENECK, J., Sohn Gottes als Christusbezeichnung der Synoptiker, Zürich 1951.
- BLACK, M., An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (2nd ed.) Oxford 1954.
- BLACK, M., The Scrolls and Christian Origins, Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament, London 1961.
- BLAIR, E. P., Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew, New York-Nashville 1960.
- BOER, W. P. DE, The Imitation of Paul, An exegetical study, Kampen 1962.
- BONHOEFFER, D., The Cost of Discipleship (ET), (complete edition) London 1959.
- BORNKAMM, G., 'End-expectation and Church in Matthew's Gospel', in: G. BORNKAMM - G. BARTH - H. J. HELD, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew (ET), London 1963.
- BORNKAMM, G., Jesus of Nazareth (ET), (rev. ed.) London 1963.
- BORNKAMM, G., etc., Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew (ET), London 1963.

- BOWMAN, J.W., 'The Term "Gospel" and its Cognates in the Palestinian Syriac', in: New Testament Essays, Studies in Memory of T.W. MANSON, (ed. A.J.B. HIGGINS) Manchester 1959.
- BRAUN, H., Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus, Jesus von Nazareth und die essenische Qumransekte, I - II, Tübingen 1957.
- BROWN, J.P., 'Synoptic Parallels in the Epistles', in: NTS, Vol.10 (October 1963), No.1 pp.27-48.
- BROWN, J.P., 'The Form of "Q" known by Matthew', in: NTS, Vol.8, 1962, pp.27-42.
- BRUCE, F.F., '"To Hebrews" or "To the Essenes"?', in: NTS, Vol.9, 1963, No.3, pp.217ff.
- BUBER, M., Two Types of Faith (ET), London 1951.
- BULTMANN, R., Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus, Sitzungsbericht der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Jahrg. 1960, 3.Abh., Heidelberg 1961.
- BULTMANN, R., Jesus and the Word (ET), Fontana Books, London-Glasgow 1958.
- BULTMANN, R., Kerygma and Myth (ET), London 1953.
- BULTMANN, R., Primitive Christianity, In Its Contemporary Setting (ET), London 1956.
- BULTMANN, R., The History of the Synoptic Tradition (ET), Oxford 1963.
- BULTMANN, R., Theology of the New Testament (ET), I - II, London 1952 and 1955.
- BURNEY, C.F., The Poetry of our Lord, An Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ, Oxford 1925.
- BUTLER, B.C., The Originality of St. Matthew, A. Critique of The Two-Document Hypothesis, Cambridge 1951.
- CARMIGNAC, J., Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness, The Evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls (ET), Baltimore-Dublin 1962.
- CARRINGTON, PH., The Primitive Christian Calendar, A study of the making of the Marcan Gospel, Vol.I, Introduction and Text, Cambridge 1952.
- CARRINGTON, PH., The Primitive Christian Catechism, A Study in the Epistles, Cambridge 1940.
- CLAVIER, H., 'L'Accès au Royaume', in: RHPR 1942, No.1.
- CLEMENTS, R.E., 'Temple and Land: A Significant Aspect of Israel's Worship', in: Transactions (Glasgow University Oriental Society), Vol.XIX, 1961-62, pp.16ff.
- CONGAR, Y.M.-J., O.P., The Mystery of the Temple, or, The Manner of God's Presence to His Creatures from Genesis to the Apocalypse (ET), London 1962.



- CONZELMANN, H., art. 'Jesus Christus', in: RGG III, coll. 619-653.
- CONZELMANN, H., The Theology of St. Luke (ET), London 1960.
- COOKE, G., 'The Israelite King as Son of God', in: ZAW, 73. Band, 1961, Heft 2, pp. 202-225.
- CROSS, F.M., Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran, A Modern Biblical Studies, London 1958.
- CULLMANN, O., Die ersten christlichen Glaubensbekenntnisse, (TS Heft 15, 2nd ed.) Zollikon-Zürich 1959.
- CULLMANN, O., Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr (ET), London 1953.
- CULLMANN, O., The Christology of the New Testament (ET), London 1963.
- CURTIS, W.A., Jesus Christ the Teacher, A Study of His Method and Message Based Mainly on the Earlier Gospels, Oxford 1943.
- DAUBE, D., The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London 1956.
- DAVIES, W.D., 'Reflections on a Scandinavian Approach to "The Gospel Tradition"', in: Neotestamentica et Patristica, Eine Freundesgabe, O. CULLMANN, Leiden 1962, pp. 14-34.
- DAVIES, W.D., The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, Cambridge 1964.
- DIBELIUS, M., From Tradition to Gospel (ET), London 1934.
- DINKLER, E., 'Jesu Wort vom Kreuztragen', Neutestamentliche Studien für R. BULTMANN, Berlin 1954, pp. 110-129.
- DODD, C.H., Gospel and Law, The Relation of Faith and Ethics in Early Christianity, New York 1951.
- DODD, C.H., The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments, London 1936.
- DODD, C.H., 'The Framework of the Gospel Narrative', in: C.H. DODD, New Testament Studies, Manchester 1953, pp. 1ff.
- DODD, C.H., The Parables of the Kingdom, (6th ed.) London 1941.
- DODD, C.H., 'The Primitive Catechism and the Savings of Jesus', in: New Testament Essays, Studies in Memory of T.W. MANSON, (ed. HIGGINS), Manchester 1959.
- DUNKERLEY, R., The Hope of Jesus, A Study in Moral Eschatology, London 1953.
- DUPONT, J., Les Béatitudes, Le problème littéraire - Les deux versions du Sermon sur la montagne et des Béatitudes, (2nd ed.) Louvain 1958.
- EASTON, B.S., Christ in the Gospels, New York-London 1930.
- EDERSHEIM, A., The Temple, Its Ministry and Services as they were at the Time of Jesus Christ (ET), (new impr.) London 1959.
- EDLUND, C., Das Auge der Einfalt, Eine Untersuchung zu Matth. 6, 22-23 und Luk. 11, 34-35, Uppsala 1952.

- EICHRODT, W., Theologie des Alten Testaments, Vol. 3, (3rd ed.) Berlin 1950.
- EICHRODT, W., Theology of the Old Testament (ET), Vol. I., London 1961.
- EISSFELDT, O., Baal Zaphon, Zeus Kasios und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer, Halle 1932.
- EISSFELDT, O., 'Jahweh als König', in: ZAW, 46, 1928, pp. 81ff.
- FAIRMAN, H. W., 'The Kingship Rituals in Egypt', in: Myth, Ritual and Kingship, ed. S. H. HOOKE, (2nd ed.) Oxford 1958.
- FARRER, A., A Study in St. Mark, London 1951.
- FLEW, R. N., Jesus and His Way, A Study of the Ethics of the New Testament, London 1963.
- FRANKFORT, H., Kingship and the Gods, A Study of Ancient Near East Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature, Chicago 1948.
- FULLER, R. H., The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, London 1954.
- GALLING, K., art. 'Berge, heilige', in: RGK I, coll. 1043-1044.
- GASTER, TH. H., The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect, In English Translation with Introduction and Notes, London 1957.
- GERHARDSSON, B., Memory and Manuscript, Oral Tradition and written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity, Uppsala 1961.
- GLOEGE, G., The Day of His Coming, The Man in the Gospels (ET), London 1963.
- GOODIER, A., S. J., An Introduction to the Study of Ascetical and Mystical Theology, London 1938.
- GRAY, J., 'The Kingship of God in the Prophets and Psalms', in: VT XI, Leiden 1961.
- GUILDING, A., The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship, A study of the relation of St. John's Gospel to the ancient Jewish lectionary systems, Oxford 1960.
- GUNKEL, H., 'Die israelitische Literaturgeschichte', in: Die Orientalischen Literaturen (Kultur der Gegenwart) ed. P. HINNEBERG, I, 7, Berlin-Leipzig 1906.
- GUNKEL, H., 'Die Königpsalmen', Preuss. Jahrbücher, 158, 1914, pp. 42ff.
- GUNKEL, H., Ausgewählte Psalmen, (4th ed.) Göttingen 1917.
- GUNKEL, H., Die Psalmen, Göttingen 1926.
- GUNKEL, H., art. 'Psalmen', in: RGK<sup>1</sup> and RGK<sup>2</sup>.
- GUNKEL, H., Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit, Göttingen 1895.
- GURNEY, O. R., 'Hittite Kingship', in: Myth, Ritual and Kingship, ed. S. H. HOOKE, (2nd ed.) Oxford 1958.
- GUTBROD, W. (KLEINKNECHT, H., and), Law (ET), BKW, London 1962.
- HASLER, V. E., Gesetz und Evangelium in der alten Kirche bis Origenes, Zürich-Frankfurt 1953.

- HENSHAW, T., New Testament Literature, (Paperback ed.) London 1963.
- HERBERT, A.S., Worship in Ancient Israel, (2nd impr.) London 1961.
- HIGGINS, A.J.B., (ed.) New Testament Essays, Studies in Memory of T.W. MANSON, Manchester 1959.
- HIGGINS, A.J.B., 'Son of Man - Forschung since "The Teaching of Jesus"', in: New Testament Essays, Manchester 1959.
- HOLM-NIELSEN, S., Hodayot, Psalms from Qumran, Aarhus 1960.
- HÖLSCHER, G., Die Propheten, Leipzig 1914.
- HÖNIG, A.G., 'Javanism' and its Scriptures', in: The South East Asia Journal of Theology, No.1, July 1959.
- HOOKE, S.H., (ed.) Myth, Ritual and Kingship, (2nd ed.) Oxford 1958.
- HUCK, A., Synopsis of the First Three Gospels, (Engl. ed. by F. CROSS) Oxford 1959.
- HUMMEL, R., Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium, München 1963.
- HUNTER, A.M., 'Crux Criticorum - Matt. xi. 25-30 - A Re-appraisal', in: NTS, Vol. 8, 1961-62, pp. 241-249.
- HUNTER, A.M., Design for Life, An Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, its Making, its Exegesis and its Meaning, London 1953.
- HUNTER, A.M., The Unity of the New Testament, (5th impr.) London 1957.
- IERSEL, B.M.F. VAN, 'Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten, Leiden 1961.
- JEPSON, J.J., St. Augustine, The Lord's Sermon on the Mount, Westminster, Maryland 1956.
- JEREMIAS, G., Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit, Göttingen 1962.
- JEREMIAS, J., Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu (3rd, completely revised ed.) Göttingen 1960.
- JEREMIAS, J., Jesus als Weltvollender, (BFT, Vol. 33) Gütersloh 1930.
- JEREMIAS, J., Jesu Verheissung für die Völker, Stuttgart 1956.
- JEREMIAS, J., The Parables of Jesus (ET), London 1954.
- JEREMIAS, J., The Sermon on the Mount, London 1961.
- JEREMIAS, J., Unknown Sayings of Jesus (ET), London 1957.
- JOHNSON, A.R., 'Hebrew Conceptions of Kingship', in: Myth, Ritual and Kingship, (2nd ed.) ed. S.H. HOOKE, Oxford 1958.
- JOHNSON, A.R., Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel, Cardiff 1955.
- JOHNSON, A.R., The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel, Cardiff 1944.
- JOHNSON, A.R., The One and the Many in the Israelite Concept of God, Cardiff 1942.
- JONES, O.R., The Concept of Holiness, London 1961.



- JÜNGEL, E., Paulus und Jesus, Eine Untersuchung zur Präzisierung der Frage nach dem Ursprung der Christologie, Tübingen 1962.
- KÄHLER, M., Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus, (new ed.) München 1953.
- KÄSEMANN, E., Das wandernde Gottesvolk, Eine Untersuchung zum Hebräerbrief, (4th ed.) Göttingen 1961.
- KLAUSNER, J., Jesus of Nazareth, His Life, Times and Teaching (ET), London 1925.
- KLEIN, G., Die Zwölf Apostel, Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee, Göttingen 1961.
- KNIGHT, G.A.F., Law and Grace, Must a Christian Keep the Law of Moses? London 1962.
- KNOX, W.L., The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, Vol. II, St. Luke and St. Matthew, Cambridge 1957.
- KUGEL, J., 'Der Begriff teleioun im Hebräerbrief', in: Theologische Studien, MARTIN KÄHLER dargebracht, 1905.
- KOOLE, J.L., 'Psalm XV - Eine königliche Einzugsliturgie?', in: OTS, Deel XIII, Leiden 1963.
- KOSMALA, H., Hebräer - Essener - Christen, Studien zur Vorgeschichte der frühchristlichen Verkündigung, Leiden 1959.
- KRAUS, H.-J., Gottesdienst in Israel, Grundriss einer Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Gottesdienstes, (2nd completely revised ed.) München 1962.
- KRAUS, H.-J., Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament, Tübingen 1951.
- KRUIF, TH. DE, Der Sohn des lebendigen Gottes, Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Matthäus - evangeliums, Romae 1962.
- KUHN, K.G., (ed.) Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten, Göttingen 1960.
- KUTSCH, E., art. 'Feste II. In Israel', in: RGK II, coll. 910-917.
- LAEUCHLI, S., The Language of Faith, An Introduction to the Semantic Dilemma of the Early Church, New York 1962.
- LEUBA, J.-L., New Testament Pattern, An exegetical inquiry into the "catholic" and "protestant" dualism (ET), London 1953.
- LIGHTFOOT, R.H., History and Interpretation in the Gospels, London 1935.
- LIGHTFOOT, R.H., The Gospel Message of St. Mark, Oxford 1952.
- LJUNGMAN, H., Das Gesetz erfüllen, Matth. 5,17ff. und 3,15 untersucht, Lund 1954.
- LOHMEYER, E., Lord of the Temple (ET) Edinburgh and London 1961.
- LOSSKY, V., The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church (ET), London 1957.
- LOVESTAM, E., Son and Saviour, A Study of Acts 13,32-37. With an Appendix: 'Son of God' in the Synoptic Gospels, Lund 1961.
- LUNDSTROM, G., The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus. A History of Interpretation from the Last Decades of the Nineteenth Century to the Present Day (ET), Edinburgh-London 1963.

- MACE, D.R., Hebrew Marriage, A sociological Study, London 1953.
- MANSON, T.W., The Sayings of Jesus, As recorded in the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke arranged with Introduction and Commentary, (reprinted) London 1954.
- MANSON T.W., The Servant Messiah, A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus, (paperback ed.) Cambridge 1961.
- MANSON, T.W., The Teaching of Jesus, Studies of its Form and Content (reprinted) Cambridge 1955.
- MARTIN-ACHARD, R., A Light to the Nations, A Study of the Old Testament Conception of Israel's Mission to the World (ET), Edinburgh-London 1962.
- MARXSEN, W., Der Evangelist Markus, Göttingen 1956.
- MARXSEN, W., 'Erwägungen zum Problem des verkündigten Kreuzes', in: NTS, Vol.8 1961-62.
- MAYER, R., REUSS, J., Die Qumranfunde und die Bibel, Regensburg 1959.
- McARTHUR, H.K., Understanding the Sermon on the Mount, London 1961.
- MICHAELIS, W., Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, 1. Teil, (Prophezei) Zürich 1948.
- MICHEL, O., Der Brief an die Hebräer, Göttingen 1949.
- MICHEL, O., 'Die Lehre von der christlichen Vollkommenheit nach der Anschauung des Hebräerbriefes', in: TSK, 5. Heft, 1934/35.
- MILIK, J. T., Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea (ET), London 1959.
- MORGENSTERN, J., 'The Suffering Servant - a new solution', in: VT, Vol. XI, Leiden 1961, pp. 292ff.
- MORGENTHAUER, R., Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis, Gestalt und Gestalt und Gehalt der Kunst des Lukas, I-II, Zürich 1949.
- MOULE, C.F.D., 'The Intention of the Evangelists', in: New Testament Essays, ed. A.J.B. HIGGINS, Manchester 1959.
- MOULE, C.F.D., Worship in the New Testament, London 1961.
- MOWINCKEL, S., Der achtundsechzigste Psalm, Oslo 1953.
- MOWINCKEL, S., He That Cometh (ET), Oxford 1956.
- MOWINCKEL, S., Le Décalogue, Paris 1927.
- MOWINCKEL, S., The Psalms in Israel's Worship, Vol. I and II (ET), Oxford 1962.
- MÜLLER, D.H., Die Bergpredigt in Lichte der Strophentheorie, Wien 1908.
- NEWMAN, M.L., The People of the Covenant, A Study of Israel from Moses to the Monarchy, New York-Nashville 1962.
- OESTREICHER, TH., Reichstempel und Ortsheiligtümer in Israel, (BFT Vol. 33) Gütersloh 1930.

- OSNES, T., Fullkommenhetstanken i Det nye testamente, En studie over begrebet teleios, Oslo 1954.
- OWEN, H. P., Revelation and Existence, A Study in the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann, Cardiff, 1957.
- OWEN, H. P., 'The "Stages of Ascent" in Hebrews V.11-VI.3', in: NTS, Vol. 3, 1956-57, pp. 243-253.
- FEDERSEN, J., Israel, its Life and Culture, London-Copenhagen, I-II 1926, III-IV 1940.
- PERCY, E., Die Botschaft Jesu, Eine traditionskritische und exegetische Untersuchung, Uppsala 1952.
- PERRIN, N., The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus, London 1963.
- PESCH, W., Der Lohngedanke in der Lehre Jesu, Verglichen mit der religiösen Lohnlehre des Spätjudentums, München 1955.
- PICKL, J., Messias König Jesus, in der Auffassung seiner Zeitgenossen, München 1935.
- PLESSIS, P. J. DU, TELEIOS, The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament, Kampen 1959.
- RAD, G. VON, Basileia, BKW, London 1957.
- RAD, G. VON, Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, München 1958.
- RAD, G. VON, Old Testament Theology, Vol. I, The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions (ET), Edinburgh-London 1962.
- RAD, G. VON, Studies in Deuteronomy, (ET), London, 1953.
- RICHARDSON, A., An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, London 1961.
- RIENECKER, F., (ed) Lexikon zur Bibel, (2nd ed.) Wuppertal 1960.
- RIESENFELD, H., Jésus transfiguré, Copenhagen 1957.
- RIESENFELD, H., The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings, A Study in the Limits of 'Formgeschichte', London 1957.
- RIESENFELD, H., 'Tradition und Redaktion im Markusevangelium', in: Neutestamentliche Studien für R. BULTMANN, Berlin 1954, pp. 157-167.
- RIGAUX, B., 'Révélation des Mystères et Perfection à Qumran et dans le Nouveau Testament', in: NTS, Vol. 4, 1957-58, pp. 237-262.
- RINGGREN, H., The Messiah in the Old Testament, London 1956.
- ROBINSON, H. W., Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, Oxford 1946.
- ROBINSON, H. W., 'The Hebrew Concept of Corporate Personality', in: Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments, ed. J. HEMPEL, 1936.
- ROBINSON, J. A. T., 'Elijah, John and Jesus: An Essay in Detection', in: NTS, Vol. 4, 1957-58.



- ROBINSON, J. A. T., Jesus and His Coming, The Emergence of a Doctrine, London 1957.
- ROBINSON, J. M., A New Quest of the Historical Jesus, (2nd ed.) London 1961.
- ROBINSON, J. M., The Problem of History in Mark, London 1957.
- ROWLEY, H. H., 'Ritual and the Hebrew Prophets', in: Myth, Ritual and Kingship, ed. S. H. HOOKE, (2nd ed.) Oxford 1958.
- RUSSEL, D. S., Between the Testaments, London 1960.
- SCHILLE, G., 'Bemerkungen zur Formgeschichte des Evangeliums', (I) Rahmen und aufbau des Markus-Evangeliums, in: NTS, Vol. 4, 1957-58, pp. 1-24, and II. Das Evangelium des Matthäus als Katechismus, *ibid.*, pp. 101-114.
- SCHLATTER, A., Die Kirche des Matthäus, (BFT) Gütersloh 1929.
- SCHMIDT, K. L., Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, Literarkritische Untersuchung zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung, Berlin 1919.
- SCHMIDT, W., Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel, Zur Herkunft der Königsprädikation Jahwes, (Beihefte ZAW 80) Berlin 1960.
- SCHNACKENBURG, R., God's Rule and Kingdom (ET), Edinburgh-London 1963.
- SCHNEIDER, J., art. 'Hebräerbrief', in: RGK III, Coll. 106-108.
- SCHNIEWIND, J., Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, (3rd ed.) Göttingen 1956.
- SCHUBERT, K., 'The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts', in: The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. STENDAHL, London 1958.
- SCHWEITZER, A., The Quest of the Historical Jesus, A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede (ET), (reprinted) London 1952.
- SCHWEIZER, E., 'The Concept of the Church in the Gospel and Epistles of St. John', in: New Testament Essays, ed. A. J. B. HIGGINS, Manchester 1959.
- SCOTT, E. F., The Crisis in the life of Jesus, New York 1952.
- SELWYN, E. G., The First Epistle of St. Peter, London 1955.
- SEVENSTER, G., De Christologie van het Nieuwe Testament, (2nd ed.) Amsterdam 1948.
- SMITH, M., 'Mt. 5. 43: "Hate Thine Enemy"', in: Harv. Theol. Rev., 1952, XLV, 71-73.
- SMITH, R. G., art. 'Perfect', in: TWBB, p. 167.
- SOUCEK, J. B., 'Salz der Erde und Licht der Welt', Zur Exegese von Matth. 5, 13-16, in: TZ, Jahrg 19, Heft 3, Mai-Juni 1963, pp. 169-179.
- STAUDINGER, J., Die Bergpredigt, Wien 1957.
- STAUFFER, E., Jesus and His Story (ET) London 1960.
- STENDAHL, K., The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament, Uppsala 1954.
- STENDAHL, K., ed. The Scrolls and the New Testament, London 1958.

- STEWART, J.S., A Man in Christ, The Vital Elements of St. Paul's Religion, (9th impr.) London 1957.
- STOTT, W., 'The Conception of "Offering" in the Epistle to the Hebrews', in: NTS, Vol. 9, No. 1 (1962), pp. 62ff.
- STRECKER, G., Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit, Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus, Göttingen 1962.
- TASKER, R.V.G., The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels, (7th impr.) London 1962.
- TAYLOR, V., The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, (3rd ed.) London 1945.
- TAYLOR, V., 'The Original Order of "Q"', in: New Testament Essays, ed. A.J.B. HIGGINS, Manchester 1959.
- THIELICKE, H., Theologische Ethik, I. Band, Prinzipienlehre, Dogmatische, philosophische und kontroverstheologische Grundlegung, (2nd ed.) Tübingen 1958.
- THURNEISEN, E., Die Bergpredigt, Theol. Existenz Heute, Neue Folge Nr 105, (5th ed. revised) München 1963.
- TINSLEY, E. J., The Imitation of God in Christ, An Essay on the Biblical Basis of Christian Spirituality, London 1960.
- TORREY, CH.C., Our Translated Gospels, London (no date).
- TRILLING, W., Das Wahre Israel, Studien zur Theologie des Matthäusevangeliums, Leipzig 1959.
- UNDERHILL, E., Mysticism, A Study in the Nature and Development of Man's Spiritual Consciousness, (University Paperbacks) London 1960.
- VAGANAY, L., 'L'absence du Sermon sur la montagne chez Marc', in: RB 1951, LVIII, pp. 5-46.
- VAGANAY, L., Le problème synoptique, Une hypothèse de travail, Paris 1954.
- VAUX, R. DE, Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions (ET), (2nd impr.) London 1962.
- VERMES, G., The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, (Penguin Book) Harmondsworth 1961.
- VILNAY, Z., Israel Guide, (4th ed.) Jerusalem 1960.
- VISCHER, W., Die Immanuel-Botschaft im Rahmen des königlichen Zionsfestes, TS Heft 45, Zollikon-Zürich 1955.
- VRIEZEN, TH. C., An Outline of Old Testament Theology (ET) Oxford 1958.
- WEISE, M., Kultzeiten und kultischer Bundesschluss in der "Ordensregel" vom Toten Meer, Leiden 1961.
- WEISE, M., 'Mt. 5.21f. - ein Zeugnis sakraler Rechtsprechung in der Urgemeinde', in: ZNW, Heft 1-2, 1958, pp. 116ff.
- WEISER, A., The Psalms, A Commentary (ET), London 1962.

- WEISS, J., Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Erster Band (2nd ed.) Göttingen 1907.
- WEYMOUTH, R.F., The Modern Speech New Testament, London 1903.
- WIDENGREN, G., 'Early Hebrew Myths', in: Myth, Ritual and Kingship, ed. S. H. HOOKE, (2nd ed.) Oxford 1958.
- WIDENGREN, G., Sakrales Königtum im Alten Testament und Judentum, Stuttgart 1955.
- WILDER, A.N., 'Form History and Oldest Tradition', in: Neotestamentica et Patristica, Eine Freundesgabe, O. CULLMANN, Leiden 1962, pp. 1-13.
- WINDISCH, H., 'Die Sprüche vom Eingehen in das Reich Gottes', in: ZNW, 1928, 27. Band, Heft 2, pp. 163ff.
- WINDISCH, H., 'Friedensbringer - Gottessöhne', in: ZNW, 1925, 24. Band, Heft 3/4, pp. 245ff.
- WINDISCH, H., The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount, A Contribution to the Historical Understanding of the Gospels and to the Problem of Their True Exegesis (ET), Philadelphia 1951.
- WINZEN, D., O.S.B., Symbols of Christ, London 1957.
- WOOD, H.G., 'Didache, Kerygma and Evangelion', in: New Testament Essays, ed. A.J.B. HIGGINS, Manchester 1959.
- ZAHN, TH., Das Evangelium des Matthäus, (3rd ed.) Leipzig 1910.
- ZAHRNT, H., The Historical Jesus (ET), London 1963.



# INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

Only the references in the text - not in the footnotes - are given. As a rule, from parallel passages only the one referred to first is mentioned.

## A The Old Testament

Genesis	page	Exodus (cont.)	page
i.27	324	xxxiv.28	82
ii.24	324	xxxv.21	148
iv.23f.	327	Leviticus	
Exodus		i.3-4	131
iv.22-23	106	ii.13	87
xii.5	131	viii	108
xii.22	147	xiv.51	147
xii.26-27	265	xvi.1-34	377
xv.17-18	99	xvi.2	375,390
xix.1	184	xvi.11-14	125
xix.6	134,271	xvii-xxvi	134
xx.1ff.	163	xix.2	123f.,134,343,348
xx.2ff.	164ff.,169,173,310	xix.12	325
xx.3	167	xix.18	331f.,343
xx.5	167	xix.22	339
xx.7	325	xx.26	344
xx.13	317	xxii.17-20	182
xx.14	321	xxii.17-25	131
xxi.12	317	xxiii.40	126
xxi.23-24	327	xxiv.7	317
xxiv	236	xxiv.19-20	327
xxiv.8	252	Numbers	
xxiv.9-10	87	vi.22ff.	175
xxiv.16f.	134	vi.24ff.	86
xxv.40	376	x.10	124
xxix	108	xviii.19	87
xxxiii.18ff.	289	xxix.1-38	96
xxxiv.14	167		

Deuteronomy	page	2 Samuel	page
iv.13	82	vi	78,100,109
v.2-3	265	vii.12-14	104
v.6ff.	163,311	vii.14	377
v.11	325	vii.14-15	122
v.17	317	xiv.20	138
v.18	321	xxii.21-24	141
vi.14f.	167	xxii.31	177
vii.2	134	xxiii.1-5	107f.
x.4	82	1 Kings	
xiv.1-29	358	i.18	88
xiv.2	134	i.33	241
xvi.13-17	125	i.38ff.	116
xvi.18	317	viii.2	125
xvii.6	248	viii.11	304
xvii.8-13	317	viii.23f.	377
xviii.13	128,135f.,141,158	viii.61	345
	167,339,345,348	viii.65	125
xix.21	327	ix.4	159
xxiii.39f.	311	xi.4	159,169,345
xxiv.1-4	323	xiv.22	167
xxvii.10	168	xv.3	159
xxix.10-15	265	xv.14	159
xxxi.10ff.	163,165,184	xx.19f.	107
xxxii.3-4	153	2 Kings	
xxxii.4	177	xi	116
xxxii.6	153	xi.12	120,299
xxxii.16	167	xiv.3	149
xxxiii.2	98	xx.3	159,192
xxxiii.4f.	98	xxi.8	168
Joshua		xxv.18	81
xxiv	144f.	1 Chronicles	
xxiv.14	188	xiii	109
xxiv.19	167	xv	109
1 Samuel		xvi	109
xvi.13	108	xvi.8ff.	187

1 Chronicles (cont.)	page	Psalms (cont.)	page
xvi.23-33	187	ii.10-12	116
xxix.19	148f.	iv.2	154
2 Chronicles		xii.3	148
xiii.5	87	xv	82,84,137ff.,145,158, 166,169f.,173,275
xvi.9	149	xv.1	139,273
xix.9	149,192	xv.1-2	131
xxv.2	148f.	xv.2	143,154,173,188,263, 288,345
xxv.3ff.	149	xv.2-5	140,273
xxv.14-16	149	xv.5	277
xxxiii.8	168	xvii.1	154
Job		xviii.20-23	141f.,145
ii.3	155	xviii.20-27	151
ii.6	155	xviii.26	263
ii.9	144	xviii.30	151f.
ii.9-10	155	xviii.33	177
iii-xlii	155	xix	174
iv.6	143	xix.7-9	152
ix.2	144	xix.8	177
ix.19-24	156	xxi.4ff.	133
xvii.3	156	xxii.22	379
xix.4	144	xxiii.4(LXX)	288
xxiiif.	145	xxiv	82,84
xxxi	145	xxiv.3	273
xxxvi	177	xxiv.3-6	137ff.,173
xxxvii.16	177	xxiv.3-10	80
xlii.2-6	157	xxiv.4	154,263,288,345
Psalms		xxiv.4-6	145f.,273
ii	110,119f.,122,123 169,299,398	xxiv.5	85,147
ii.1-9	115	xxiv.6	192
ii.2	365	xxvi.1-3	143,145
ii.3	368	xxvi.4(LXX)	289
ii.6	119	xxvi.6-8	143
ii.7	104,110,123,138, 170,172,203,235 299f.,365,375,399	xxvi.11-12	143,145



Psalms (cont.)	page	Psalms (cont.)	page
xxvii.4	146,289	lxviii.29	76f.
xxvii.8	192	lxxii.1	171
xxix.1-2	105	lxxvi.2f.	94
xxxvi.11(LXX)	283	lxxviii.70-72	173
xxxvii.11	271,282	lxxviii.72	123,159
xxxvii.39-40	284	lxxx	88,110,161f.,173,311
xl.1-4	285	lxxx.8-16	163f.,310
xlvi	311	lxxx.13	173
xlvi	88	lxxxiv.10-12	142,145
xlvi.1-7	62	lxxxiv.12	143
xlvi.3(LXX)	326	lxxxv.8-13	292
xlvi.5	61	lxxxv.13	154
xlvi.5-9	89f.	lxxxix	123
xlvi.8	88	lxxxix.3	121
xlvi.1-3	92	lxxxix.7-8	105
xlvi.4	94	lxxxix.19-28	120f.
xlvi.9-11	154	lxxxix.20ff.	122
1	311	lxxxix.20-30	104
1.2-3	162	lxxxix.40	299
1.5	87	xciii	88
1.6	154	xciii.1	88
1.7	162,173,310	xcv	88,161
1.16-20	163,310	xcv.1-3	96,281
li.10	148	xcv.1-6	79
li.10-12	147	xcv.1-11	99
li.15-17	147	xcv.7	161,173
li.18ff.	147	xcv.7-11	162,310
lxiii.2-4	290	xcvi	88
lxiii.8	290	xcvi.1-3	58,95,187,286
lxv	90	xcvi.2	95,282
lxv.4	274	xcvi.10	58,88,95
lxviii.7-10	76f.	xcvi.13	93
lxviii.17	76f.	xcvii	88
lxviii.18	77	xcvii.1	88
lxviii.25	79	xcvii.1-5	88

Psalms (cont.)	page	Psalms(cont)	page
xcvii.6	154	cxxxii	77
xcviii	88	cxxxii.6-10	77ff.
xcviii.1-3	286	cxxxii.10	79
xcviii.2	94	cxxxii.12	299
xcviii.6	282	cxxxii.13-14	99
xcviii.9	93	cxxxii.17	99
xcix	88	Proverbs	
xciv.6-8	98	iii.11-12	377,379
xcix.9	76	xi.20	177
c.1-4	281	xiii.6	143
ci	123,169ff.	xxviii.18	143
ci.6	172,177	Isaiah	
cv.10	299	ii.1-4	304
cx	109f.,122,123	ii.2	65,66,251f.
cx.1	116	ii.2-4	65,66,251f.
cx.1-2	119	ii.2-5	316
cx.1-7	117	ii.3	312,359,367
cx,3	104	ii.5	313
cx.4-5	119	vi.1-13	93
cxviii	84	vii.14	158
cxviii.19-20	146,154,285	ix.1	302
cxviii.19-29	84	ix.2	127,302
cxviii.24	86	ix.5	300
cxviii.25	126	ix.6	300,302
cxviii.26	138,146,175,273	ix.6-7	300
cxviii.26-27	79f.,188	xxv.6-8	126
cxviii.26-29	126	xxviii.16	227,231
cxviii.27	80,86	xxxiii.7-9	280
cxix	174f.	xxxiii.10	281
cxix.1	177	xxxiii.14-16	83
cxix.1-3	174	xxxiii.17	290f.
cxix.79-81	174	xxxiii.20-22	290f.
cxix.80	177	xxxv.1-10	56
cxix.89	174	xxxv.3	379
cxxii.1-2	61	xxxviii.3	159,377

Isaiah (cont.)	page	Jeremiah (cont.)	page
xlff.	311	xxxix.9	106
xl.3	55,59,65,178f.,	xxxix.31	252
	194,198f.,379	xxxix.31-34	316,324,363,376
xl.9-10	58	xxxix.33	367
xlvi.1	203,235	xxxix.34	366ff.
xlvi.6-9	302f.	Ezekiel	
xlvi.2	203	xviii.5ff.	146f.
xlvi.7	292	xviii.9	147,154
xlvi.8	154	xl.1	124
xlvi.13	154	xl.2	179
xlvi.3	326	xlvi.1-12	304
xlvi.5	303	xlvi.25	125
xlvi.6	303	xlvi.1-12	194
li.6	154	Daniel	
li.8	154	vii.22	271
lii.7	95f.	Hosea	
lii.7-8	58	ii.14-15	194
lii.10-12	232	ii.16f.	324
lii.12	377	ii.19-20	324
lvi.7	244	vi.6	250
lvi.8	244	x.12	154
lx.1	304	xi.1	106,110
lx.3	304	Joel	
lxii.10-12	241	ii.1	125
lxvi.1	326	Micah	
Jeremiah		iii.8	107
ii.1-3	324	iv.1-4	65
ii.20	368	vi.6-8	83
v.4-5	368	Habakkuk	
vii.2	137	ii.3-4	378
vii.2ff.	139	Haggai	
vii.11	245	ii.6-9	304
xxii.1	247	Zechariah	
xxii.5	247	ix.9	241f.
xxiii.21-22	106	ix.10	241



Zechariah (cont.)	page	Malachi	page
ix.11	252	iii.1ff.	199,246
xiv.16	126	iii.1-5	56
		iv.5	246

### B The New Testament

Matthew	page	Matthew (cont.)	page
ii.22-23	158	v.3-11	262f.
iii.1ff.	54	v.3-12	46,79
iii.2	59	v.4	279ff.
iii.3	55,59,199	v.5	282ff.,295
iii.7	56	v.6	284ff.,295
iii.7-10	54	v.7	286ff.
iii.9	344	v.8	145,157,270,288f.,
iii.11	56		355,361
iii.15	52,284	v.9	75,266,291ff.,295,
iii.17	203		300,355,359,363,385
iv.1-11	204	v.10	263ff.,284,295f.,328
iv.3	204	v.11	265,295
iv.5	204	v.12	262,295
iv.6	204	v.13	87,260,294,300f.,332,
iv.11	199		351
iv.13	63	v.13-16	46,261,294,298ff.,
iv.17	55,57,219,377		350,371,401,408
iv.21	226	v.14	87,127,179,188,253,
iv.23	57,219		294,312,332,351
iv.23-25	37,39,57	v.14-16	301ff.
v-vii	7,19,29,31,33,	v.15	218,305
	42ff.,47,53,235f.	v.16	261,264,266,305,312,
v.1	46,66		409
v.1ff.	61	v.17	45,52,307,314
v.1-2	36,37,39	v.17-19	44,306
v.3	60,75,213,263ff.,	v.17-20	44,45,306,350
	275ff.,296	v.18	45
v.3-10	371,401	v.20	333,354,378,404

Matthew (cont.)	page	Matthew (cont.)	page
v. 21	166	v. 48	7, 11, 19, 128, 133, 153,
v. 21ff.	307		156, 166, 260f., 333, 335ff.,
v. 21-22	163, 308		343ff., 366f., 372, 386, 393,
v. 21-24	334, 371, 401		402f., 407
v. 21-26	317ff.	vi	45
v. 21-48	46, 163, 314	vi-vii	370f.
v. 23f	216	vi. 1	45, 53, 284
v. 23-24	320	vi. 2-4	45
v. 27	166	vi. 2-6	46
v. 27-30	163, 308, 321f., 334	vi. 2-18	268
	379	vi. 4	325
v. 27-48	371, 401	vi. 5-6	45
v. 28	322	vi. 6	325
v. 29	322	vi. 7-15	45
v. 29-30	33	vi. 9-13	268
v. 31-32	323f., 334	vi. 10	269, 369
v. 32	308	vi. 12	320
v. 32f.	324	vi. 13	75
v. 33-37	166, 308, 325f., 334	vi. 16-18	45, 46
v. 35	92	vi. 18	325
v. 37	163	vi. 19-21	45, 46, 277, 278
v. 38	308	vi. 22f.	314
v. 38-42	327ff., 334	vi. 22-23	46
v. 39	308	vi. 24	46
v. 41	33	vi. 25-32	369
v. 43	308, 344	vi. 25-34	45
v. 43-47	260, 334, 353	vi. 33	284
v. 43-48	329ff., 338	vi. 34	33
v. 44	308, 318	vii	46
v. 45	75, 260f., 266, 333, 361,		
	363, 367, 385, 403	vii. 1-2	319
v. 46-47	333	vii. 6	46
v. 45-48	354ff.	vii. 7-11	46
v. 47	336	vii. 12	46

Matthew (cont.)	page	Matthew (cont.)	page
vii.13	79	xi.20-24	217,221f.
vii.13-14	46,212f.,404f.	xi.25	230
vii.15-27	46	xi.25f.	225
vii.16-18	314,357	xi.25-30	362ff.,385f.,404
vii.16-19	46	xi.27	366f.
vii.21	46,214,268	xi.28-30	368f.
vii.21-23	294	xi.29	228,369
vii.24	310	xi.29-30	225
vii.24-27	46,230,267,294, 347,356,370f.,374 401	xii.1-8	217
		xii.4	227
vii.28-29	36	xii.5	216
viii.1	37	xii.6	216,217
viii.2	37	xii.6-7	250
viii.4	216	xiii.11	61
viii.5	63	xiii.53ff.	222
viii.11	332	xiv.1ff.	222
viii.11-12	66,229,251.	xiv.13	221
viii.12	245	xv.1ff.	222
viii.14	238	xv.21	221f.
viii.24	238	xv.24	218,245
ix.13	226	xv.29	53
ix.37	218	xvi.13	222,229,238
ix.38	218	xvi.13ff.	222
x	218,407	xvi.15	222,364
x.1ff.	38	xvi.16	229,374
x.5-6	218,245	xvi.16-18	222f.
x.7	219	xvi.17	223f.,365
x.9-10	219	xvi.18	222,226ff.,237,370,
x.19-20	369		375
xi.3	56,199	xvi.19	223
xi.4	246	xvi.21	221,231
xi.10	54,199	xvi.24f.	225
xi.14	236	xvi.27	228
xi.14-15	57	xvi.28	228
xi.20	229	xvii.1-8	232



Matthew (cont.)	page	Matthew (cont.)	page
xvii.2	235	xxvi.55	283
xvii.5	235	xxvi.62-64	250
xvii.5-xviii.35	235	xxvii.62	49
xvii.10	246	xxviii.7	254
xvii.12	231,236	xxviii.16-20	244,254,406
xvii.12-13	246	xxviii.18-20	27
xvii.24-27	238	Mark	
xviii.8-9	322	i.2f.	54
xviii.17	226	i.10	203
xviii.18	223	i.11	203,204
xviii.23ff.	237	i.14	217
xix.9	323	i.16f.	40
xix.16	353	i.21	36
xix.16f.	335ff.	i.21ff.	63
xix.17	336,404	i.39	37
xix.21	7,277,336ff.,353	i.40	37
xix.21-22	276	ii.1-iii.6	37
xix.23-24	276	ii.19	218
xxi.1ff.	240	iii.7-12	37,38
xxi.5	241	iii.13	36,37,39,41
xxi.8	126	iii.13-19	37,38
xxi.9	80,126	iii.14-15	38
xxi.10-12	200	iii.19	40
xxi.12-13	243	iv.11	61
xxi.13	244	iv.21	298
xxii.30	323	vi.7	38
xxiii.1ff.	368	vi.7-13	38,219
xxiii.13	273	vi.8-9	219
xxiii.24	33	vii.24	222
xxiii.37-39	240,247	vii.33	222
xxiv.1-3	247f.	vii.36	222
xxv.31ff.	251,338	viii.13	222
xxvi.28	377	viii.23	222
xxvi.26-29	252	viii.26	222
xxvi.52	283	viii.30	222

Mark (cont.)	page	Luke (cont.)	page
viii.31	231	i.17	57,213
viii.32-33	223	i.75	284
viii.27	225	ii.10-11	279
viii.38	234	iii.10	282
ix.1	234	iv.31ff.	63
ix.2	234	vi.12	39
ix.30	238	vi.12-13	36
ix.31	231	vi.12-20	38
ix.33	238	vi.13	40
ix.43-48	321f.	vi.15	283
ix.50	298	vi.17	40,45
x.6-9	323f.	vi.20	39,60,275ff.
x.19	341	vi.20-23	262
x.23	275	vi.20-49	31,33,42ff.
x.24-25	214,275	vi.21	279ff.,284ff.
x.28	275	vi.22	265
x.38-39	232	vi.24	273f.
x.42-45	271	vi.24-26	7,11
x.45	232	vi.27-28	329ff.
xi.7	244	vi.27-35	308
xi.9-10	242	vi.27-38	343
xi.11	242	vi.29-30	327ff.
xi.17	245	vi.32-34	333
xi.27-33	246	vi.32-36	329ff.
xi.33	247	vi.35	355
xiii.3	248	vi.36	7,11,286,342f.
xiii.5-27	250	vi.43f.	314
xiii.29	250	ix.1-6	219
xiii.30-32	251	ix.18f.	200
xiv.58	228,248f.,255	ix.22	231
xiv.62	233	ix.43f.	200
xv.29	248f.	ix.44	231
xv.38	252	ix.51-xix.27	199,221
Luke		x.lff.	244
i.1-4	342	x.1-16	219

Luke (cont.)	page	The Acts (cont)	page
xi. 1	268	v. 1-11	277
xi. 33	305	vi. 13	253
xii. 21	279	vi. 14	248
xii. 22-31	278	vii. 47-50	253
xii. 32-34	277	vii. 53	374
xii. 33-34	278	viii. 36	407
xii. 57-59	317	viii. 37	102
xiii. 24	212, 404	ix. 2	64, 200
xvi. 18	308	ix. 37	374
xvii. 20-21	239, 270	xix. 9	200
xviii. 31f.	200	xix. 23	200
xix. 41-44	240	xxii. 4	200
xix. 43-44	248	xxiv. 14	200
xix. 45	200	xxiv. 22	64, 200
xxi. 31	250	xxvii. 9	125
xxi. 37	246	Romans	
xxii. 15-17	252	i. 3f.	102
xxii. 29f.	271	v. 1	293
John		viii. 14	385
i. 1f.	362	viii. 16	385
i. 12-13	362	xii. 1-2	347
i. 14	362	xiii. 8-10	343
i. 18	362	1 Corinthians	
i. 34	203	ii. 1-iii. 3	380
ii. 19	248	iii	38
iii. 21	210	iii. 9-11	255
iii. 16	362	iii. 11	231
iii. 18	362	iii. 16-17	255
The Acts		vi. 19-20	255
i. 13	283	xi. 23-25	252
i. 15	253	xii. 31	408
ii	253f.	2 Corinthians	
ii. 1ff.	233	iii. 14ff.	103
ii. 20	254	v. 18f.	293
ii. 43-47	277	vi. 16-vii. 1	255



Galatians	page	Hebrews (cont.)	page
iii.19	374	iii.14	374
Ephesians		iv.14	374,380
ii.17	318	iv.14-v.14	375
ii.17-22	256	iv.15	383
ii.20	230	iv.16	377
Philippians		v.1	392
i.6	351	v.1-10	386
1 Timothy		v.4	387
iii.2	324	v.5	380,383
iii.12	324	v.5-6	387
2 Timothy		v.8	380,384,386,387
ii.22	288	v.8-vi.3	382
Hebrews		v.9	10,372,384,387,388,
i.1-2	315,401		394
i.1-4	373	v.10	383
i.2	380	v.11-14	381,383,393
i.3	374	v.11-vi.3	380f.,405
i.5	377,380	v.14	372
i.5-13	374	vi.1	7,372,375
i.8	380	vi.1f.	382
ii.1-4	374,393	vi.4	390
ii.5-18	374	vi.6	374,380,391
ii.7	385	vi.7-8	351
ii.9	385	vi.8	372
ii.10	297,372,380,384,	vi.9	394
	385,387,388,394,403	vi.10	351,391
ii.11	384,386	vi.11-12	392
ii.12	379	vi.12	375
ii.17	383,384,387	vi.19-20	375,384,390,404
iii.1	374,383,392	vi.20	383,392
iii.1-6	375,380	vii.1	375
iii.3	380	vii.1-x.18	380
iii.5	378	vii.3	372,380
iii.6	372,378,380	vii.11	372,376,389,394
iii.7-iv.13	375	vii.19	219,372,377,389

Hebrews (cont.)	page	Hebrews (cont.)	page
vii.26	383	x.19-21	378
vii.27	125,392,405	x.19-22	390
vii.28	372,380,384,386, 387,388	x.19-25	377,378
viii.1	377,383	x.21	380
viii.1-6	376	x.22	377
viii.5	393	x.23	374,378,390
viii.6	376	x.25	378
viii.13	376	x.26-39	378
ix.1-10	376	x.29	374,380,386
ix.9	372,376,388,393	x.32	390
ix.10	376	x.35-39	378
ix.11	372,383	x.40	378
ix.12	390,394	xi.1-40	378
ix.13	386,388	xi.39-40	389
ix.14	376,388,391,392, 393,394	xi.40	372
ix.15	378,389	xii.1	378
ix.22	376	xii.1-3	390
ix.24	376,385,387,392	xii.2	372,377,378,390,405
ix.26	376,385,392	xii.3-11	379
ix.28	377,378,394	xii.5	380
x.1	372,388	xii.7	379,380
x.2	393	xii.8-24	380
x.7	388	xii.9	377
x.10	386,388,392	xii.12	379
x.11	383	xii.14	391
x.12	388	xii.18ff.	379
x.13	389	xii.22-24	389
x.14	372,377,386,388, 389,390,391,394,403	xii.23	297,372
x.15-18	389	xii.28-29	379
x.18	375,390,394	xiii.4	379
x.19f.	394	xiii.7	392
x.19-20	405	xiii.8	387,393
		xiii.9	393
		xiii.10	393
		xiii.12	386

Hebrews (cont.)	page	1 John	page
xiii.14	379	ii.1	362
xiii.15	374,392,393,394	ii.12	362
xiii.16	392,393,394	iii.1f.	385
1 Peter		iii.10	385
i.16	129	iv.9	362
ii.4-8	226f.	iv.19	343
ii.6f.	231	v.2	385
ii.9	393	Revelation	
		xvi.15	310
		xxi.14	231

# INDEX OF REFERENCES TO THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

## The Community Rule

1 QS, or CR		1 QS, or CR (cont.)	
i	183	ii.11	193
i.1	192	ii.11-17	187
i.4	331	ii.18	187
i.7f.	188	ii.19	183
i.8	187,190,193,195, 196	iii	197
i.9	188	iii.3	196
i.16	183	iii.3-6	193
i.18-19	187	iii.9	196
i.18-ii.18	186	iii.13	188
i.19-20	187	iii.24	188,191
i.21f.	187	iii.25	188,191
i.22-24	187	iv.15-26	197
i.24-ii.1	187	iv.22	196
ii	183	v.1	186
ii.1-4	187	v.6	186
ii.2	188,193,196	v.8	186
ii.4-10	187	v.8ff.	179,183
ii.9	188	v.10	186
ii.10	187	v.21	186



1 QS or CR (cont)	page	The Damascus Rule	page
v.22	186	Dam, or DR	
vi.7-9	180	i.10-11	196
vi.10	180	i.21	196
vi.13	186	ii.15	196
vi.17	196	vi	181
viii-ix	181	vii.5	196
viii.1	196	xi	181
viii.5	179	xx.2	196
viii.8	179	xx.5	196
viii.9	196	xx.7	196
viii.10	196	The War Rule	
viii.14-16	178,199	1 QM, or WR	
viii.16	195	i.1	188
viii.18	196	i.3	188
viii.20	179,196	i.9	188
viii.21	196	i.11	188
viii.21f.	195	i.13	188
ix.2	196	ii	181
ix.4-5	186,193,347	xiii.1ff.	183
ix.5	182,186,196	xiv.7	275
ix.6	179,196	The Hymns	
ix.8	196	1 QH, or H	
ix.9	196	v.24	228
ix.19	196	vi.26	228
x-xi	193	xiv.8-22	191
x.10	189	xiv.23-28	191
xi.2	191	xvi.1-7	191
xi.2-3	189	xvi.7	192,193
xi.8	179	xvi.8-20	191
xi.9-11	189	xvi.17	193
xi.11	191	xvii.9-15	191
xi.13	191	xvii.16-18	192
xi.14	191	xvii.17-25	191
xi.15-20	190	Commentary on Habakkuk	
xi.17	191	1 QpHab xii.6f.	180